

the international
communist
and
working-class
movement



progress



**Leninism
and
the National Question**



the international
communist
and
working-class
movement



INSTITUTE OF MARXISM —
LENINISM, CC CPSU

Leninism and the National Question



MOSCOW
PROGRESS PUBLISHERS

Translated from the Russian by VIC SCHNEIERSON

P. N. Fedoseyev in collaboration with
M. I. Kulichenko and I. F. Anoshkin, E. A. Bagramov,
J. G. Golotvin, S. T. Kaltakhchan,
K. H. Khanazarov and E. M. Zhukov

ЛЕНИНИЗМ И НАЦИОНАЛЬНЫЙ ВОПРОС
В СОВРЕМЕННЫХ УСЛОВИЯХ

Авторский коллектив: П. Н. Федосеев и др.

На английском языке

First printing 1977

© Издательство Политической литературы, 1974

© Translation into English from revised Russian edition.
Progress Publishers 1977

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

10504-278
Л _____ 61-76
014(01)-77

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	9
<i>Chapter 1. THE MARXIST-LENINIST TEACHING ON NATIONS AND NATIONAL RELATIONS</i>	17
1. The Theory of Nations	17
2. Nationalities, National and Ethnic Groups	44
3. Nationality	50
4. The Theory of National Relations. Internationalism and Nationalism	53
5. The Objective Foundations for the Development of Nations and National Relations	72
I. THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN BOURGEOIS SOCIETY	81
<i>Chapter 2. THE WORKING CLASS AND THE NATIONAL QUES- TION. THE LIMITS TO ITS SOLUTION UNDER CAPITAL- ISM</i>	94
<i>Chapter 3. THE NATIONAL QUESTION AND THE STRUGGLE FOR ITS SOLUTION IN THE CAPITALIST WORLD IN THE FIRST AND SECOND STAGES OF THE GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM</i>	117
1. Lenin Works on the Theory of the National and Colonial Questions in the Period After the October Revolution	117
2. Victory of the October Revolution. Changes in the Content of the National Question in the Capitalist World	128
3. The Building of Socialism in the USSR and Changes in the Content of the National Question Under Capitalism	152
4. Special Features in the Development of Nations and National Relations in the Second Stage of the General Crisis of Capitalism	170

II. THE SOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL QUESTION. DEVELOPMENT AND CONVERGENCE OF NATIONS UNDER SOCIALISM	188
<i>Chapter 4. NATIONS AND NATIONALITIES UNDER SOCIALISM</i>	197
1. Determining Factors in the Socialist Development of Nations	198
2. The Features of Socialist Nations and Their Development Trends	204
3. Internationalism—the Ideological Basis for the Socialist Development of Nations	210
<i>Chapter 5. ECONOMIC FACTORS UNDERLYING THE DEVELOPMENT AND CONVERGENCE OF SOCIALIST NATIONS AND NATIONALITIES</i>	216
1. Economic Cooperation Among Nations Building the Material and Technical Basis of Socialism	217
2. Further Consolidation of Economic Ties Between Nations and Nationalities in Developed Socialist Society	224
3. The Economic Foundations for the Development and Convergence of Nations Within the World Socialist Community	231
<i>Chapter 6. THE NATIONAL STATE UNDER SOCIALISM</i>	236
1. Lenin's Leadership in the National State Question	240
2. Leninism and Relations Between Socialist States	259
<i>Chapter 7. SOCIALISM AND THE MUTUAL INFLUENCE AND ENRICHMENT OF NATIONAL CULTURES</i>	271
1. Cultural Development and National Culture	271
2. The Development and Rapprochement of Socialist National Cultures	276
3. The Dialectics of the Content and Form of National Culture	283
4. National and International Languages of Communication. Their Place in the Development of Culture and the Rapprochement of Nations	289
<i>Chapter 8. SOCIALIST PATRIOTISM AND INTERNATIONALIST EDUCATION</i>	300
1. The International Substance of Socialist Patriotism	300
2. The Main Trends in Internationalist Education	309
3. The Specific Features of Nations, Classes and Social Groups and Their Bearing on Internationalist Education	320

<i>Chapter 9. THE SOVIET PEOPLE—A NEW HISTORICAL COMMUNITY</i>	327
1. Social and International Unity of Nations and Nationalities—an important Objective Law of Socialist Society	328
2. The Soviet People at the Present Stage	333
 III. THE NATIONAL QUESTION AND THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS	344
 <i>Chapter 10. THE WORLD SOCIALIST SYSTEM AND ITS INFLUENCE ON THE CONTENT OF THE NATIONAL QUESTION</i>	382
1. Internationalism—the Determining Social Factor of Relations Between the Peoples of the Socialist Countries	382
2. Influence of the World Socialist System on the Development of Nations and National Relations in the Modern World	420
 <i>Chapter 11. THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT AND THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN THE DEVELOPED CAPITALIST COUNTRIES</i>	438
1. The Working-Class Movement and the National Question in the World Revolutionary Process	438
2. Sharpening of the National Question in Capitalist Countries	446
3. Struggle for the International Unity of the Working Class	461
 <i>Chapter 12. THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT AND THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES</i>	469
1. Correlation of the National and Social in Present-Day National Liberation Revolutions	469
2. The Processes of National Consolidation	483
 <i>Chapter 13. THE IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE OVER THE NATIONAL QUESTION</i>	504
1. Two Opposite Approaches to the National Question	504
2. The Inconquerable Force of Proletarian Internationalism and the Bankruptcy of Its Critics	518
<i>Conclusion</i>	537

INTRODUCTION

The history of humankind in the epoch of imperialism and transition to socialism is closely tied to the theory and practice of Leninism. The development of nations and national relations occupies a prominent place among the many problems of society to which V. I. Lenin devoted himself and which are still dealt with under the determining influence of his teaching. It is his genius that showed the working class the theoretical approach to and practical ways for solving the national question.

Lenin developed the ideas of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels into a comprehensive teaching, defining the scientific principles for the international working-class and communist movement's policy and programme on the national question. He substantiated the idea that in the new historical conditions the class struggle of the proletariat merges with the struggle against national oppression, and the struggle for socialism with the anti-imperialist struggle for the liberation of the oppressed peoples.

Lenin's teaching on nations and national relations is built on a profound study of the laws of social development, the inner life of the peoples and their mutual relations. His propositions on nations and national relations are part of the Marxist-Leninist science, which exercises a tremendous influence on the solution of problems arising in the life of individual peoples and humanity as a whole. In 1885 Engels pointed out that Marxist theory is the strongest international bond of the proletarian movement.

Lenin's teaching on nations and national relations is scientifically grounded and class-oriented. He described it as "a national programme from the proletarian standpoint".¹

The programme and policy of Marxist-Leninist parties take account of the fact that national and international processes occur on so many planes that they must be reckoned with in all the spheres of society. Lenin pointed out that the national question requires a clear approach and solution based on the socialist standpoint, that the working class must fight for progress in all parts of the national question and reckon with all the objective conditions relating to the development of nations and national relations and their reflection on the economy, the policy of classes, the life of the Party, the state apparatus, class consciousness, culture, psychology, everyday life, and the people's traditions.²

Lenin's teaching on nations and national relations, like all Marxist-Leninist science, is distinguished by a creative approach. Mindful of the tenet of Marx and Engels that Marxism is a living thing — not a dogma, but a guide to action — Lenin never lost sight of its link with the specific tasks of the times, tasks that change with each new turning point in history.

The past more than half a century has been just such a turning point. The rapid development of the world revolutionary process, the transition to socialism, the scientific and technological revolution, and the internationalisation of modern society, are recasting many aspects in the destiny of the peoples. So, opening the laws of society's revolutionary transformation, Marxism-Leninism is in large measure a study of nations and national relations, because radical social change is inconceivable if national problems, and relations between nations in general, are not drawn into the picture.

In his contribution to the theory and practice of resolving the national question, of the development and drawing together of nations and nationalities, Lenin showed with unassailable accuracy the place and role of nations and national

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 41.

² See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, pp. 91, 115, 116, 118, 243, 249; 428, 429; Vol. 20, pp. 22, 34-35, 36; Vol. 19, pp. 504, 539, 540, 541; Vol. 20, pp. 224, 396, 400, 411; Vol. 19, pp. 499.

relations in society, the relation of the social (class) to the national, and of the national to the international. This at a time when the class battles of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, of the passage from capitalism to socialism, were at an exceedingly high pitch. His teaching is still the theoretical weapon and practical guide helping the working class and its parties to align national relations with the content of the epoch, with the stage of development and the special features of their country, hewing for society the way to progress and socialism.

Lenin's theory on nations and national relations, on capitalism's two tendencies in the national question, and on the content and forms of proletarian internationalism (like many other aspects of the teaching on nations and national relations) is fundamental for the strategy and tactics of the international working-class and communist movement. His elaboration of the principles of proletarian internationalism, and his insistence on implementing them, have made internationalism a crucial factor of social development in the present stage. He was the first to determine the ways of spreading the influence of proletarian internationalism to the national-liberation and democratic movements, and also the first to show its place in the development of world socialism.

Lenin's analysis of the connection between national movements and the world revolutionary process as a whole is of great help in determining the role of the national question in capitalist conditions. This is borne out by the new phase of the peoples' struggle for emancipation, exhaustively examined by the 1969 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties. Especially relevant for this phase is Lenin's proposition that in studying national revolutions and their growth into social revolutions we should consider the specific qualities and development levels of each of the countries flinging off the imperialist yoke.

It is certainly no exaggeration to describe as vital for the bulk of humanity Lenin's proposition that the right to self-determination applies to all peoples, in particular those of colonial and dependent countries (while social-opportunists restricted it to only "civilised" peoples), including those that have not yet evolved into nations. The new content of the

slogan of self-determination, too, is associated with Lenin's name. He did not confine it to just national statehood. For him it encompassed all internal problems of a people's development and its right to choose its own social and political system. The exercise of the right of nations to self-determination has in fact become a vital factor of the gradual drawing together of the peoples, as well as of free national development.

Analysing the national question of the imperialist epoch and its place in the class struggle, Lenin examined the social consequences of the world's division into oppressor and oppressed nations. In the existing conditions, he showed, the programmes of proletarian parties should work for the triumph of democracy, using all aspects of the national question requiring a solution for grouping the democratic forces round the working class.

Truly invaluable for the present and future of all peoples are those of Lenin's propositions that concern the ways and means of resolving the national question under socialism.

In capitalist society, Marxism-Leninism shows, the national question is not only evidence of that society's antagonistic development, but also of its obvious impotence to eliminate national conflicts. In contrast to bourgeois attempts to resolve these conflicts by national division, the working class takes an entirely new course based on the socialist reorganisation of society—the course of unity, of cooperation and mutual aid, and of joint struggle for progress. Socialism alone, Lenin showed, can provide the impulse for the natural historical process of bringing nations closer together on the basis of the internationalist principles, mutual trust, equality and free will.

The formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the flowering and drawing together of the nations, national and ethnic groups of the USSR, corroborate the Marxist-Leninist approach to the question of nations and national relations, and are evidence of the tremendous advantages of socialism. In the Soviet Union, the CC CPSU stressed, "*the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the national question has stood the practical test of time, and the Leninist nationalities policy has scored full victory*".¹

¹ *On Preparations for the 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*. Resolution of the CC CPSU, Moscow, 1972, p. 19.

The solution of the national question by the Soviet Communist Party, the successful development of the Soviet multinational state in the past more than fifty years, confirm the Marxist-Leninist propositions that the national question may be conclusively solved only through the socialist reconstruction of society; that unlike the formal bourgeois democracy, which proclaims but does not enforce national equality, socialist democracy guarantees equal rights and opportunities to all peoples and creates the conditions for the solution of national problems with consideration for the vital interests of the working people of different nationalities; that the close unity, all-round flowering and drawing together of all nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union have their roots in the socialist nature of its system, and are an objective integral law of socialist development; that the union of socialist republics is the most viable and perfect structure of a multinational state, which harmoniously combines the interests of the entire society and those of every nation.¹

Lenin defined the principles of union and friendship in socialist multinational states and the socialist world community. This is one of the central aspects of his teaching on nations and national relations under socialism. Relations based on socialist internationalism, he pointed out, produce a new social factor, a new motive force for the development of society; the friendship of working people of different nationalities, their cooperation and mutual aid for progress and socialism. The unity and strength of the Soviet Union confirms this fully.

Lenin also left behind essential advice concerning the main lines of solving the national question in the fraternal family of socialist states, and showed how the experience of the socialist world influences the approach to national problems of peoples in the capitalist world.

Lenin's teaching is the antithesis of nationalism and chauvinism and the related cosmopolitanism and national nihilism. Bourgeois nationalism hinders progress by accentuating self-isolation, mutual hostility and hatred, which often lead to costly wars; cosmopolitanism and national nihilism breed pessimistic ideas about the decline of nations, writing off as futile all

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

attempts to establish friendly relations and cooperation. In both cases, distortion of the national consciousness is used by the imperialists in their fight for world supremacy and in suppressing other nations. Leninism, on the other hand, shows the extraordinary potentialities that the peoples acquire under socialism, asserting the optimism generated by the flowering and drawing together of nations, the joint building of communism, and the creation of common cultural values.

Bourgeois ideologists portray Lenin and his followers as nihilists who disregard the national question and give precedence to social problems. It is quite true that in matters related to nations and national relations Marxists-Leninists attach decisive importance to the class standpoint. But this does not detract from their concern with the national question and their universally acknowledged success in resolving it under socialism.

The successful solution of the many problems arising in the development and mutual relations of peoples in the socialist countries is proof of the power and viability of Lenin's teaching. And additional evidence comes to hand every day. Leninism alone provides the resources for, say, recording scientifically the changes in the development of nations and national relations under the impact of the scientific and technological revolution underway in both capitalist and socialist countries, and also the changes arising in some countries which are approaching the period of mature socialist society, and in the Soviet Union which is building communism.

Lenin's teaching on nations and national relations is embodied in the successes of the world socialist system and the international working-class and national-liberation movements. The world communist movement is advancing it continuously in step with the times. As a result, the ideology of proletarian internationalism has acquired new facets, and new ways have been elaborated for its implementation. The place of the national question in the international working-class and national liberation movements, and in the development of the socialist countries, has been more specifically defined. Also, the relevance of national problems for the Leninist programme of communist construction in the USSR has been established with greater clarity.

Faithful to Lenin's propositions on nations and national relations, elaborating on them in keeping with the needs of the times, the 1969 Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties said in its resolution: "We Communists oppose all forms of oppression of nations and national minorities. We want to see every nation or national group develop its own culture and language, and we firmly defend the right of all nations to self-determination."¹ The world revolutionary process continues to unfold and the struggle of the two world systems is becoming sharper. For this reason, the Meeting elaborated on Lenin's principles of proletarian internationalism, namely, on the relation of the class element to the national element in the revolutionary struggle, and on the international and national tasks of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist parties.

The 24th Congress of the CPSU dealt with the question of nations and national relations in the period of communist construction. It outlined concrete ways of assuring the further flowering and drawing together of the nations and nationalities of the USSR, fortifying their friendship and cooperation, consolidating the Soviet people as a new historical community, and educating society in the spirit of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism.

The Party's documents on the 50th anniversary of the USSR, notably the relevant CC CPSU resolution and Leonid Brezhnev's anniversary report, are an invaluable contribution to the Marxist-Leninist teaching on nations and national relations.

The imposing achievements of the Soviet people in the more than 50 years of the Soviet multinational state provide a splendid foundation for the further development of Marxism-Leninism. Leonid Brezhnev said in his report: "It would be impossible to overestimate the contribution that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, created on Lenin's initiative, has made in the course of half a century to the history of mankind under the leadership of the Communist Party. The fact that the USSR was the first to build a socialist society and was the first to show in practice what really equal fraternal relations

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, Prague, 1969, p. 35.*

between peoples are will undoubtedly be remembered and valued by all peoples for all time to come.”¹

The development of Marxism-Leninism, including the teaching on nations and national relations, is both a guarantee of the future victories of the world revolutionary movement and an imposing monument to the immortal Lenin.

* * *

This book attempts to set out the content of the national question in the present time, to show the potential and vitality of Lenin's teaching in assessing the various aspects of the development of nations and national relations, and its enrichment by the Communist and Workers' parties. It makes no claim to being an exhaustive study of all the aspects of the subject. Some are dealt with cursorily, others are merely mentioned.

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, Moscow, 1972, p. 87.

CHAPTER ONE

THE MARXIST-LENINIST TEACHING ON NATIONS AND NATIONAL RELATIONS

As in all other fields of human activity, Marxism-Leninism, the most advanced revolutionary doctrine of our time, plays a crucial role in the solution of problems related to the development of nations and national relations. It established the fact that the laws governing the formation and development of nations and national relations are cognisable, that the working class can produce a scientifically grounded policy to resolve the national question and assure the flowering and drawing together of nations, to rally people of all nationalities on the basis of proletarian internationalism. All this was a decisive factor in the revolutionary remaking of the old world and the building of a new, classless society.

The Marxist-Leninist teaching on nations and national relations comprises the theory of nations and national relations, study of the content of the national question and of its solution, the question of the essence of proletarian internationalism and its antithesis—bourgeois nationalism. It establishes the interconnection of class and national problems in the development of society, and the significance of this for the victory of the socialist revolution and for the building of socialism and communism.

1. THE THEORY OF NATIONS

The progress of humanity has always given rise to successive or parallel communities of people—class, national, and others.

Their appearance and succession is impelled by the development of society, of its different spheres.

The tribe, nationality and nation occupy a prominent place among the socio-historical communities. As long as nations and nationalities exist, their development and drawing together is also bound to give rise to various multinational communities, such as the community of Soviet people in the USSR, in the era of socialism and communism. Once socialism is established throughout the world, these communities will merge first into several and then into a single international community, the precursor of the merging of nations, of the nationless epoch in human history.

More than 2,000 years ago the concept *natio* (Latin) came into use to express the ethnic peculiarities of different communities of people, implying the early forms of community—community of family, language, customs, and beliefs. Originally applied to only tribal communities, the concept was later extended to the populations of territories, states, individual nationalities and, with the decay of feudalism and the birth of capitalism, also to a qualitatively new formation—the nation. The classics of Marxism-Leninism, too, used the concept “nation” in all these meanings.

As a historical community of people, the nation is an extremely complex social organism, whose essence and peculiarity stem from the identity of social and ethnic,¹ objective and

¹ Certainly, the ethnic is also always social, but in defining the national the theory of nations and national relations usually differentiates between social and ethnic. By social it always implies class factors, and by ethnic a reflection of what is essentially the form, not the substance, of the processes of social development.

The *social* in the formation and development of nations are primarily the economic ties of people and the intrinsic unity of classes and strata these ties create. The meaning of the social in the national is also rooted in the class, and accordingly political, division of society on the basis of class aims and interests.

The *ethnic* in the national is chiefly the language, territory and features (but not the entire content) of the culture, way of life, beliefs, traditions, mentality and psychology shaped by the geographical environment, common origin and centuries of historical development, frequently still in the clan or tribe. Despite considerable changes in their content, these qualities later continued to reflect (and still reflect) mainly the form of social development. Naturally, in an antagonistic society some of the ethnic qualities of a nation—the national

subjective factors. Marxism-Leninism refers the emergence of nations proper to the capitalist epoch. Having originated as "an inevitable product, an inevitable form, in the bourgeois epoch of social development",¹ they also exist under socialism. They will not disappear until the stage of mature communism sets in all over the world. In all these periods the national form exercised, exercises and will exercise a considerable influence on the development of mankind.

Marx, Engels and Lenin substantiated the dialectical-materialist theory of nations from every angle, and contrasted it to the idealistic and metaphysical theory of capitalist ideologues.

The fundamentals of the dialectical-materialist theory of nations and national relations were worked out by Marx and Engels. On the basis of the conditions of ascendant capitalism, they defined in outline:

a) the law-governed inception of the national form of social development following the birth and consolidation of capitalism, stressing the historically transient character of national communities;²

b) the decisive role of the economic factors, especially common economic life, in the formation and progress of nations, and the development of national relations;³

c) the strong bearing of class factors on the development of national and international processes, the influence of proletarian internationalism and bourgeois nationalism;⁴

culture, mentality, psychology, and partly customs and traditions—have a contradictory class character. This is traceable to economic, political and cultural influences, and must be reckoned with.

The social and ethnic in the essence of nations, in national relations, are dialectically connected, unbreakably united, though it is the social (class) factors that always play the determining role.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 72.

² See K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* (in 3 volumes), Vol. 1, Moscow, 1973, p. 112.

³ See *ibid*, pp. 111-12; Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Berlin, 1968, Bd. 4, S. 416.

⁴ See K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Moscow, 1976, Vol. 6, p. 6, p. 390; K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* (in 3 volumes), Moscow, 1973, Vol. 2, pp. 17-18; Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Berlin, 1968, Bd. 16, S. 388; Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Berlin, 1962, Bd. 21, S. 362.

d) the importance for the formation of nations of a common language and common territory;¹

e) the strong influence on the development of nations and their mutual relations of the national culture, national mentality and character, which are socially (class) contradictory in antagonistic societies.²

Lenin's contribution to the Marxist theory of nations was a new stage, the ultimate rung in its development. The struggle for working-class power, he held, should reckon with the visible sharpening of class antagonisms between capitalists and workers in the imperialist stage. The development of nations and national relations held an important place in society in general, and the ideological struggle in particular. This is why perfection of the Marxists' theoretical weapon in this domain is of the utmost importance.

Lenin turned to the problem of nations and national relations at the very outset of his scientific and socio-political activity.

When he came to grips with Narodism, he revealed the theoretical aberrations of its ideologists, and upheld and developed the *materialist* Marxian conception of nations.

His contribution to the Marxist theory of nations lay in pinpointing the *social* essence of nations, in particular the correct relationship of the social and ethnic. N. Mikhailovsky, the ideologue of liberal Narodism, portrayed the nation as a purely ethnic category. National ties, he maintained, were the continuation and generalisation of tribal ties.

His ideas were unscientific and politically harmful. In order to sidestep the question of the contradictory class nature of nations, the Narodniks reduced the essence of nations to ethnic phenomena, which they said were independent of social

¹ See K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, Moscow, 1968, p. 480; Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Berlin, 1973, Bd. 5, S. 353-56; Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Berlin, 1962, Bd. 21, S. 396.

² See K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Moscow, 1975, Vol. 3, p. 473; K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, p. 43; K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* (in 3 volumes), Vol. 1, pp. 117-18; Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Berlin, 1968, Bd. 16, S. 158; K. Marx and F. Engels, *Ireland and the Irish Question*, Moscow, 1974, p. 124; F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1975, p. 220; K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Moscow, 1975, Vol. 2, p. 139.

processes. Countering this view and recognising the social essence of nations, Lenin showed the utmost importance of determining the place and role played in their formation and development by classes and the class struggle. He stressed that the forging of national ties was, in fact, the forging of bourgeois, that is, social ties. It was therefore wrong, he said, to close one's eyes to the contradictions between the classes forming the nation.¹

Lenin also made brilliant use of the dialectical-materialist approach in studying the essence of national relations. He showed, for example, that national feelings were not self-determined, but rooted in the interests of the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie.² National relations, he pointed out, were also affected by the dissimilarity of the social composition of different nations.³

As the class battles between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie grew in scale, the essence of nations and national relations became a central issue in the ideological struggle of materialists and idealists, revolutionaries and opportunists — a struggle that became international.

Early in 1914, Lenin stressed that the Marxists of that time were still giving little attention to *theoretical basis*⁴, and that in the national question opportunists frequently waved the Marxist flag. He noted that there were even "two theories", one being the true Marxist dialectical-materialist theory, and the other, Otto Bauer's "idealistic theory of nation".⁵

Lenin analysed the substance of the deviations from Marxism, and elaborated on all the valuable elements contained in the true Marxist literature on the national question.

In a number of his works he specially examined attempts "to give a scientific definition of the concept nationality"⁶, that is, nation. For Otto Bauer, Lenin wrote, "the nation is *Kulturgemeinschaft* (cultural community — Ed.)". Demolishing

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 227; Vol. I, p. 155.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 155-56.

³ See *Lenin Miscellany* XXX, p. 30 (in Russian).

⁴ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 41, p. 315.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol. 7, p. 99.

Bauer's attempts to reduce the nation to a cultural community and point up the national character as the main element of the nation, Lenin showed that though the slogan of national culture could *transcend* its bourgeois content¹ during the inception and emergence of capitalism, it was totally bourgeois in Bauer's interpretation, while Bauer's notions of the national character had "an idealistic basis".²

Examining the social essence of nations and national relations, pinpointing their contradictory class nature under capitalism, Lenin stressed the place of internationalism in their development and the necessity of combating nationalism. First, because internationalism and nationalism were conspicuous in the struggle between bourgeois and proletarian ideologies and, second, because Bauer peddled his interpretation, an idealistic or, as Lenin called it, "psychological" theory of nations as a Marxist theory.

Lenin showed that Bauer's conception of nations was saturated with bourgeois nationalism, was based on an exaggeration of ethnic factors (which is the substance of bourgeois nationalism) and disregarded the social, especially class, contradictions within capitalist nations. Bauer tried to portray the nation as a non-historical category whose evercasting development under socialism would see a continuous strengthening of specific national traits. Bauer's views, Lenin wrote, were "nationalism purified, refined, absolute, right up to socialism", "nationalism in socialism". Bauer, he noted, had completely forgotten internationalism.³ Even Karl Kautsky, obviously reluctant to take Bauer to task for extolling nationalism's role in the development of nations, was, Lenin observed, compelled to register his "*exaggeration of the national factor and a terrible underestimation of the international factor*".⁴ Bauer's "theory" was in substance "*national opportunism*".⁵

¹ See *Lenin Miscellany XXX*, p. 53 (in Russian); V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 380.

² *Lenin Miscellany XXX*, p. 53 (in Russian).

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 41, p. 315.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. 19, p. 117.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. 41, p. 315.

Lenin described the main properties of national community. That was another important contribution to the Marxist theory of nations. He did not reduce the essence of nations to a simple listing of properties. He concentrated on their content and interconnection. This was due to the doubtless significance of these properties for understanding the essence of nations, and also to their opportunistic interpretation by Bauer and to the inaccuracies of Kautsky (though then still a Marxist).

Bauer denied that nation was a historical category. Lenin, on the other hand, emphasised the historical character of nations, showing the conditions in which they emerge and develop, and calling attention to the inevitable amalgamation of nations in the future.¹

Such properties of a nation as language and territory are mentioned both by Bauer and Kautsky. Yet it was Lenin who delved in real depth into their content.

In Kautsky's description, in fact, language was seemingly the main property of a nation. He saw language as a purely ethnic factor. Lenin, however, though attaching importance to language as an ethnic factor, mainly looked into its social significance for the inception and development of nations.² Language could not have played its social role if it had been immutable during the growth of a nationality into a nation. Lenin, therefore, made a thorough study of the changes in languages during the passage from feudalism to capitalism. He found, among other things, that language became standard in the full sense of the word, that a qualitative change came about and language became literary.³

Lenin's presentation of the role played by territory in the formation and development of nations, too, differed very substantially from that of Bauer and Kautsky. He rejected Bauer's attempts to portray the nation as an extraterritorial category. Neither did he agree with Kautsky, who registered nothing more than "settlement in a definite territory" during the process of national consolidation. Lenin did not deny the ethnic character of territory in the making and growth of

¹ See *Lenin Miscellany* XXX, p. 53 (in Russian); V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 147; Vol. 20, p. 125; Vol. 23, p. 196.

² See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 48.

³ See *ibid.*, Vol. 19, p. 499; Vol. 41, p. 314.

nations, but also looked into its role in their formation and socialist development.¹

Kautsky, in effect, underestimated the nation's economic community, while Bauer did not even mention it. Yet for Lenin the "economic property" was the main one. A nation, Lenin held, is welded by the proliferation of economic ties and the emergence of an internal market. For him all other properties were, in substance, derivatives of, or at least subordinate to, the community of economic life, existing as factors that condition this community.

For Lenin community of economic life is the factor behind the formation of a nation, whereas the national state is just one of the important conditions for the nation's emergence and development. This is why in one of his definitions of the nation he placed "its economic foundations (the internal market)" at the top of the list, while not even mentioning the national state. There is only a cursory reference (which followed the conclusion, "language as the main means of communication") to the more general factor, "the unification of national regions".²

In a number of cases Lenin noted that the "national state is the rule in the record of world history".³ Yet for him it is a derivative of the economic requirements, and he stresses precisely its economic necessity.⁴ The main thing is not a nation's statehood, but the nation's unification in fighting for a state. Among the features of social development during the nation's formative period Lenin singled out "the political superstructure over the economy. Democracy, sovereignty of nation. Hence, 'national state'..."⁵ In his notes on Kautsky's book *Nationality and Internationality* he put down this special point: "Bauer underestimates the urge for national state".⁶

The properties of the capitalist nation are best listed by

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 41, p. 314.

² See *Lenin Miscellany XXX*, p. 53 (in Russian).

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 41, p. 314; Vol. 20, p. 400.

⁴ See *ibid.*

⁵ See *ibid.*

⁶ See *ibid.*

Lenin in the following precis: "Language and territory. The main thing. (Economic property.) Historical character."¹ Lenin's genius seized unerringly on the main points that make up a nation and set it apart from other types of socio-historical communities.

Marxist-Leninist parties, including the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, always take guidance in the dialectical-materialist theory of nations worked out by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

Mindful of the properties of nations and their combinations given by the classics of Marxism-Leninism, Stalin produced the following definition of nation in 1913: "*A nation is a historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture.*"²

In 1929 he described the features of socialist nations that set them apart from the capitalist.³ Stalin's definition of nation helped to ascertain its essence, and figured in the battle against idealistic and metaphysical interpretation of the nature of nations and the related programmes, like the notorious programme of "national-cultural autonomy". However, it should be remembered that in the decades since its publication new facts have come to light concerning the formation and development of nations, the correlation of their properties, and the role of nation in social progress. Particularly important is the vast experience gained through the existence and development of socialist nations, and through the peculiar formation of nations in developing countries. Mutual influence and enrichment have become deeper, which fact, too, should get its share of attention in the theory of nations.

The discussion of various aspects of the theory of nations has shown that in defining the nation we should also consider the following points:

first, it is important to stress more definitely that nation is a *historical* community and consequently a transient, rather than eternal category;

¹ *Lenin Miscellany* XXX, p. 53 (in Russian).

² J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Moscow, 1953, Vol. 2, p. 307.

³ See *ibid.*, Vol. 11, pp. 348, 354-56.

second, it must follow from the definition that the properties of a nation are not equivalent, that the main and determining property is community of economic life, and that the number of properties that go into the general description of the nation is not an absolute;

third, the place and role of the national psychology must be defined more clearly. The old concept, "psychological make-up of a nation", if taken in its full sense, represents all the areas of social psychology, and not just its national peculiarities. Even if we were to confine the concept "psychological make-up" to these peculiarities alone, we should find that they are embodied not only in the culture, but also in the consciousness, life style, ethics and traditions. Lastly, the psychological make-up may be regarded as a supra-class conception, which, however, it cannot be in a class society.

In the period of transition from capitalism to socialism the ideological struggle between the two opposite social systems has sharpened immeasurably, and bourgeois ideologists attribute a conspicuous place in it to the definition of nations and national relations. They inflate the ethnic factors, and in general the specially national, in their propaganda, and in effect ignore the class factors in the development of the national and its continuous enrichment with the achievements of other nations.

There are two trends in the bourgeois interpretations of the essence of nations. One of them is based on objective idealism. While acknowledging the existence of nations, it denies their social essence, and reduces all its properties to purely ethnic factors, to an ideological and cultural life taken out of the class context, to consciousness, to psychic, and to feelings. The other trend altogether denies the existence of nations as an objective reality, and tries to prove from a subjective idealistic angle that nation is purely a product of the human mind.

The opponents of the Marxist-Leninist theory of nations want to isolate the essence of national community from reality, to prove it incognisable, to pronounce it an idea, consciousness, psychic. Hans Kohn, for example, argues that the decisive factors in the development of nations are the will, the national idea. S. M. Lipset maintains that the nation is a psychic phenomenon, a reflection of people's historical experi-

ence. For K. Boulding, on the other hand, the nation is the embodiment of the national consciousness, which he describes as the most active motive force of the 20th-century society.¹

Bourgeois scholars refute the idea that the nation is a social category, a historical community. Max Savelle holds, for example, that the nation exists merely as a concept shared by many people. Peter Laslett concurs, maintaining that nation is just a metaphor. For Maurice Cranston the basis of the nation is the national will. His opinion, rooted in the ideology of nationalism, is that the existence of a nation depends on the will, the common desire of people. The subjectivist concept of the nation, writes Jacques Chevalier, is based on the notion that a nation is created by the wish of living together.²

Apart from its scientific importance, the Marxist-Leninist theory of nations is consequently of great practical importance as a means of the revolutionary explanation and transformation of the world, as a weapon in the struggle against bourgeois ideology. The theory of nations must nullify all bourgeois ideological devices and expose their class character.

We might suggest the following definition: "*The nation is a lasting historical community of people constituting a form of social development based on the community of economic life in combination with the community of language, territory, culture, consciousness and psychology.*"

First, this definition accentuates Lenin's thesis that the nation is a form of social development. Second, it singles out the determining factor of the emergence and development of the nation as a social community—the community of economic life. Third, it stresses that the other properties of the nation did not come about by themselves and do not exist by themselves, but in combination with the community of economic life. Fourth, it includes among the properties of the nation the special features of its culture, consciousness and

¹ See H. Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism*, N. Y., 1961; S. M. Lipset, *The First New Nation*, N. Y., 1967; K. Boulding, *The Meaning of the 20th Century*, N. Y., 1965.

² *The American Historical Review*, 1962, Vol. LXVII, № 4; *L'idée de Nation*, P., 1969.

psychology. This characterises the specifically national in the spirit of a people more accurately than the previous definition.

The fact that the social nature of the same nation is entirely different under capitalism and socialism makes it exceedingly difficult to pinpoint the new that appears in this form of social development once class antagonisms are eliminated. Yet nations not only remain, but also make all-round progress in the socialist environment because here society needs a continuous and considerably closer unity of people than exists under capitalism. The nation's stability and relatively long existence as a community among other historical social communities is, indeed, the result of this need at different stages of social and economic development.

A nation's stability does not imply an equal degree of unity at all stages. Marx, Engels and Lenin stressed that even within the same socio-economic formation the degree of a nation's unity varies from one stage to another in its development as a community. In fact, referring to capitalist conditions Lenin even figuratively said that there were two nations within each nation.¹ This is a highly important point for understanding the essence of capitalist nations. Certainly, Lenin did not question the existence of capitalist nations as a conflicting and contradictory whole. His formula was meant to help reach the depth and complexity of the nature of capitalist nations. Lenin's "two nations" are the two opposite class sides of one (but not single) national community. Also, his formula accentuates the conventionality and relativity of national unity under capitalism, stemming from the incompatibility of the basic class interests and aims of the bourgeoisie and the working class in the economic, political and cultural domains.

Under socialism national unity is immeasurably stronger, because of the coinciding main, class and national interest of all the working people—the building of socialism and communism. But since the working class is the leading force behind the transformation of society, its class interest is also the class and national interest of the working farmers and people's intelligentsia. Naturally, it is the class interests that play the determining role in the manifestation of national interests.

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 32.

This is true both if a country's population is nationally homogeneous and if it is multinational.

Human progress has for a very long time been closely linked with the existence and development of the nation—a form of community which stimulates growth of material production. Also, it is the bearer of the material and cultural values accumulated over many generations; it produces the sense of responsibility for defending and multiplying them, and the sense of national pride, and generates the maximum unity in assuring further progress.

This alone shows that the stability of nation as a community took a long time to evolve, and that nation is a historical category, as the classics of Marxism-Leninism have repeatedly demonstrated.¹ This is an important point, particularly in countering bourgeois ideas about the “eternity” of nations. Yet a time is sure to come when the social need for the national form of human development will drop away. Then, all nations will amalgamate.

The essence of nations as communities is embodied in social ties typical of either capitalism or socialism. These emerge in close unity with ethnic ties, but play the leading role in relation to the latter. This is a very important feature, for precisely the unity of the two types of ties expresses the substance of national ties, of national consolidation.

In the complicated system of social ties community of economic life has the decisive bearing on the evolution of nations. This was established by Marx and Engels. It was the doing away with the scattered state of production, of property and of the population, their concentration, they said in the *Communist Manifesto*, that impelled political centralisation, with independent provinces connected by what were mere alliances becoming “lumped together into *one nation*”.²

Lenin held that relations of production contain “the explanation of all the phenomena of social life, human aspirations, ideas and laws”.³ Capitalist production introduced

¹ See Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Berlin, 1969, Bd. 11, S. 195; Bd. 13, S. 253; V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 125; Vol. 23, p. 196.

² K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* (in 3 volumes), Vol. 1, p. 113.

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 22.

a new element into the development of mankind—the new social division of labour, the lumping together of different provinces (especially as a result of the emergence of a single market), the closer economic interdependence of town and village, and the like. This new element brought about the appearance of national ties. It stands to reason that these bourgeois economic ties did not get their national form by themselves, by some built-in peculiarity, but as a result of their specific combination with the already existing ethnic ties, which also underwent certain changes with the coming of the capitalist epoch. There are many economic ties even more enduring than those which impel the emergence of national ties. But since they are not interconnected with the ethnic factors, they have no part in the shaping of national ties.

That national ties embody both the nationally specific and the borrowed finest achievements of other peoples is also to be traced to the nature of the economic ties forged with the inception of capitalism. In the capitalist stage the proliferation of economic connections is accompanied by a proliferation of cultural ties, and the strength of the internal national ties is ensured by their interaction with international ties. In the socialist states, the mutual influence and enrichment of nations and nationalities are especially extensive because they have a new socio-economic foundation and become a permanent objective of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist parties.

Apart from the emergence of nations, the capitalist period is marked, as Marx said, by the development of “the universal intercourse founded upon the mutual dependency of mankind, and the means of that intercourse”.¹

The capitalist epoch with its large-scale machine industry, Lenin noted, tends to destroy the parochial character of the social ties typical of nationalities, producing national and, no less important, international ties.² This is why from the moment of its inception the nation develops as a complex unity of the specifically national and the borrowed achievements of

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* (in 3 volumes), Vol. I, p. 499.

² See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 211.

other nations. More, the significance of the latter increases all the time. This is particularly true in the socialist epoch, because the new system cannot consolidate itself through the isolated development of some single nation.

Consequently, the nation comes into being in a close unity with other communities, being the product and a condition of human progress. The link between the development of each nation and of all humanity is traceable to the identical structure and the identical laws governing the progress of all nations. To a still greater extent it is traceable to borrowing of other peoples' achievements, on the one hand, and enrichment of other nations with one's own contribution to world civilisation, on the other.

The study of nations should not be reduced exclusively to the specifically national elements, to what distinguishes one nation from another. The most widely dissimilar nations have many things in common—things that are basic for the unification of the advanced forces of different nations in the battle for progress.

The formation of a nation impelled by the evolution of economic community, is accompanied by a qualitatively new pattern of inner political life, whose content is, of course, shaped by class relations. But alongside and together with these we must also account for the significance of a national state for all classes and social strata. This significance is not equal for each class or social stratum, but must be reckoned with all the same. It is precisely the formation of a national state, and the emergence of many other social processes in the stage of nation (as compared with the stage of nationality), that leads to a consolidation of political ties within the framework of individual classes. This is secured by political parties and public organisations, which bring people together to a greater or lesser degree on the basis of identical interests and aims.

If the formation of a nation is accompanied by a mass national movement against feudalism or foreign oppression, the bourgeoisie may even achieve a semblance of unity through slogans calling for a "single" national culture and an "all-national" state. But such "unity" is always relative, because the take-over by the bourgeoisie is only a new stage in the clash

of class contradictions and the class struggle. The enlighteners did not understand this. They "not only spoke of the people in general," Lenin pointed out, "but even of the nation in general", failing to single out any particular class of the population as an object of special attention.¹ Yet the significance of the new stage in economic development lay precisely in the entirely new role of classes, the entirely new role of their relationship. First, a capitalist nation consists of new classes as compared with a feudal nationality. Second, the correlation of the classes and their role in the life of the people are also new.

Nations are headed at first by the bourgeoisie, which makes "the aggrandizement of the nation as a whole conditional on its own aggrandizement".² And as the capitalist nation evolves, the antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat increases. Capitalism, Lenin said, "breaks down national barriers more and more, does away with national seclusion, and substitutes class antagonisms for national antagonisms".³ Already in bourgeois society, the working class becomes the subject of the nation, the leading force in many spheres, for it is the class on which "reposes the strength and the capacity of the development of the nation".⁴ It is the working class that determines the perspectives of national development, and becomes the bearer of the truly national aims, of the vital interests of the nation's vast majority.

It follows then that class relations, conditioned as they are by economic relations, play the determining role vis-à-vis the national ties of people of different classes.

Not every nation goes through the stage of a national movement. That depends on the concrete historical situation of its formation or development. And for one reason or another a national state may not even arise. However, *socio-political activity of a nation is necessary*, for in its absence there is no striving and no capacity for independent creativity and development. Marx and Engels associated the viability of nations with the degree of their *political* evolution, and first

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 526.

² Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Berlin, 1969, Bd. 4, S. 51.

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 73.

⁴ K. Marx and F. Engels, *On Britain*, Moscow, 1962, p. 277.

and foremost with the strength of their urge for national-historical activity.¹ This urge is impelled by economic factors. Lenin, for example, warned that "Marxists cannot lose sight of the powerful *economic* factors that give rise to the urge to create national states."²

The role of ethnic factors is in no way obscured by the precedence we give to social factors in national development. The nation is a complicated unity of social and ethnic factors, but it is the former that play the determining role.

A common language and a common territory are two highly important ethnic elements in the definition of socialist as well as capitalist nations. But though these two factors are more stable than the others, they come under the head of "eternal" only formally, because, in fact, they are in a state of continuous change and development. Still more this applies to their social role and significance for national development.

When we say that language is one of the properties of a nation we do not mean language in general. It is a standard language used by the entire nation, a language that has superseded dialects and is based on an enriched vocabulary, the proliferation of its social functions, the evolution of a developed system of styles, and the like. Only that standard language can meet the needs of economic intercourse in the epoch of capitalism and socialism (in the nationality stage this ability is rather limited). Another important point is that language assures community of cultural life no matter how conflicting its class content, but this, of course, in a unity with other elements that have their origin in the economic and political domains. Certainly, it is the emergence of economic community and its decisive bearing on national development that predetermines the qualitatively new role of language in a nation's cultural life, and especially in the national awakening—its impact on the formation, spread and influence of national ideas, and in general on all processes of national consolidation. Before a language becomes one of the leading

¹ See Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Berlin, 1968, Bd. 16, S. 157-58.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 400.

factors in culture, wrote Lenin, it has already become "the chief instrument of human commercial relations".¹ Nationality and identity of language, he wrote, "are an important factor making for the complete conquest of the home market and for complete freedom of economic intercourse".² Saying that a common language and the need for its unimpeded development are a crucial condition for national consolidation, Lenin implied re-creation or what may be described as the "restoration of language", its growth from a sum of spoken dialects and the written language into a new quality—a standard national language.³

This role of the national language is, however, secondary. As we have shown, it follows from the influence of the nation's economic community, and not from any self-contained significance of the language or its immutability over thousands of years.

For various reasons some peoples did form into, and continue to exist as, nations on the basis of a borrowed language. But this does not deprive the national community of its usual properties and qualities. The important thing is that the language should, even though it may have changed with the march of history (and that is most often the case), fully provide for the need of popular unity, for the needs of the masses, for their progress.

The integrity of the life of a people in the stage of nation is inconceivable without territorial community. A nation's economic life, the re-creation of its language, and its national awakening in general, must necessarily be accompanied by a territorial integration of the national regions. In this sense territory has ethnic significance, being not simply a place of residence, but also the fatherland, arousing patriotic feelings and welding people into a community. Territory, therefore, is a crucial natural geographic condition for the development of the nation, a united social organism.

Apart from language and territory, the important factors behind the emergence and development of nations include

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 41, p. 314.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 20, p. 48.

³ See *ibid.*, p. 314.

national culture, national consciousness, national psychology,¹ national customs and traditions. All these play a specific role and are closely connected, forming a unity. But they are also conflicting factors from the class standpoint, constituting a blend of the peculiarly national and of that borrowed from other nations.

Marx, Engels and Lenin, who listed common language and territory, and, as the main factor, common economic life, among the properties of capitalist nations, did not mention common national culture. This does not mean that they denied its existence. They omitted it due to its contradictory class nature, for they did not want to help the bourgeoisie even indirectly in promoting the national culture slogan as an instrument of class harmony within the nation. Besides, it was a time of very sharp class antagonisms, which impelled the appearance of such "theories" of nations as Otto Bauer's, in which common national culture was raised to an absolute and its role described as determinative, and national culture defined as the main property of nations along with common destiny. Lenin proved the fallacy of Bauer's viewpoint.²

Would that mean that a common culture is not typical of capitalist or socialist nations? No, it does not. Lenin's statement, "there are two nations in every modern nation", did not deny the existence of capitalist nations any more than his statement,

¹ The concepts "national culture", "national consciousness" and "national psychology" are usually used as working aids in studying the essence and forms of the cultural life of nations. To understand them we must consider, firstly, their contradictory class nature in antagonistic societies, and, secondly, their relative independence. Save for some stages in the development of a class society (national movements for freedom and independence, wars of defence, and the like), they mainly reflect the interests of the dominant class, rather than national interests. It would be ridiculous to isolate national culture from the entire material and spiritual culture, national consciousness from public consciousness, and national psychology from social psychology. Therefore, national culture, national consciousness and national psychology stand for the national peculiarities of the culture, consciousness and psychology of peoples. They owe their existence as concepts to the special significance of the aforementioned phenomena in the development of nations and national relations, and to the necessity of considering them in any analysis of the processes of social progress under both capitalism and socialism.

² See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 41, p. 316.

"there are two national cultures in every national culture"¹, denied the existence of these nations' national culture. It merely drew attention to the duality of national culture in capitalist conditions, to its contradictory class nature, to the fact that it is no more a unity than the nation itself. Lenin was a staunch opponent of the slogan of national culture in the setting of growing class antagonisms, but he admitted (in the autumn of 1913) that "a hundred and twenty-five years ago, when the nation had not been split into bourgeoisie and proletariat, the slogan of national culture could have been a single and integral call to struggle against feudalism and clericalism."²

The material and spiritual values of national culture, like its form and content and its social and ethnic elements, are not isolated from each other, and are always interwoven. But typically by "national culture" we usually mean spiritual culture.

National consciousness and *national psychology*, which reflect national community in the social consciousness and social psychology respectively, are also contradictory in the class content.

History shows that underestimating the role of the national consciousness and psychology, especially in the conditions of burgeoning socialism, has a negative effect on the internationalist education of the people. Their special role in the formation of nations in Asia and Africa is another reason why we must study their essence. For in Asia and Africa they often evolve before economic and political community and, partly, even before cultural community.

National consciousness and national psychology cannot be studied and understood, unless we consider the important, even decisive, fact that they coexist with class consciousness and class psychology, and that they are governed by the consciousness and psychology of the dominant class.

Marx and Engels recognised the existence of national consciousness, and in their early works called attention to the contradictions "between this national consciousness and the

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 32.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 19, p. 380.

practice of other nations, i. e., between the national and the general consciousness of a nation".¹ Making free use of the concept "nation's mentality",² Engels stressed in the mid-1870s that it was liable to be penetrated by negative elements.³

Lenin referred to its important role, noting that capitalism is awakening to life and *consciousness* a number of "new" nations, large and small.⁴ Besides, he made frequent use of the terms "the people's minds" and "national ideology", and this quite definitely in the sense of "national consciousness".⁵

National consciousness is that constituent of the social consciousness which reflects a nation's perception of the sum-total of internal national ties, including those in the national psychology, and its conception of the entire sphere of international relations. Understandably, national consciousness is to a greater or lesser extent predetermined by the class consciousness, and is therefore always of a class character.

National self-awareness is part of the national consciousness and chiefly represents a nation's perception of itself, of its being. It possesses an essentially socio-class content, whereas ethnic self-awareness is based first and foremost on ethnic properties.

National consciousness has a complex structure based on three factors: class interests, national ties, and international relations.

Its main elements are:

a) national self-awareness, also with a complex structure embracing, among other things, ethnic self-awareness and expressing in a general form the awareness of national affinity and the need for national community;

b) national ideas, national interests, national pride (including the national in patriotism), national feelings, national traditions, national features of the life-style;

c) the nation's capacity for making history, expressed in its appreciation of its national element and, if it has a state, also of

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, p. 43.

² See K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, pp. 148, 149; Vol. 3, p. 473.

³ F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, p. 211.

⁴ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 103.

⁵ See *ibid.*, Vol. 20, p. 237; Vol. 21, pp. 160, 313.

state sovereignty and the striving to contribute to world civilisation;

d) awareness of all the aspects of relations with other nations, nationalities, national and ethnic groups.

The level of national consciousness also reflects the individuals' appreciation of the fact that the nation cannot exist in isolation, especially under socialism, that in their progressive development the peoples have a common destiny, must respect the right of other peoples to free development, value their achievements, and recognise the leading role of the international in relation to the specifically national, perceive the universal human aspirations, and internationalism as an element of patriotism.

There may be many temporary elements in the national consciousness of the bourgeoisie while it is the leading force of the nation: different combinations and forms of racism, nationalism or chauvinism, an exaggerated sense of national pride and patriotism, of the nation's part in the history of the world or that of other peoples, national hostility, hatred, dislike, resentment, and so on.

National consciousness evolves in two ways: a) on the basis of the reflection of the life of the nation and its relationships on the plane of ordinary consciousness; b) through people's acceptance of the scientific generalisation of the nation's development and its relations with other nations.

National consciousness forms a complex unity with national psychology. But they are not completely fused. Neither are they identical by nature: the former is chiefly an ideological factor, while the latter is also a manifestation of the subconscious in man's activity.

To be sure, the line between national consciousness and national psychology is sometimes blurred. It would be foolish, for example, to speak of national pride, patriotism and traditions, and overlook the connection between these important elements of the national consciousness with the national character and national feelings, which are essentially part of national psychology.

National psychology includes a) the national character; b) national feelings; c) national features in temperament, sentiments and habits; d) the psychological foundation of national

traditions and customs. The national psychology is shaped by the nation's social, economic, political and ideological life and also by common history and common natural and geographical conditions.

Among the typical, and in antagonistic societies also class contradictory, features of nations are national customs and traditions. They mirror a nation's life — its productive activity, life-style, history, relations with other peoples, and the like. Customs and traditions embody as a complex unity various aspects of the national culture and consciousness, the psychological and ethical aspects of people's lives. This may be illustrated by the customs in certain industries, traditional festivals and other celebrations, family traditions, local costumes, the upbringing of children, guest entertainment, wedding and funeral rites, and the like.

Though national customs and traditions are stable, they are certainly not immutable or strictly national. They are strongly affected by changes in the life of the nation, especially in the socio-economic domain, by historical twists and turns, and relations with other peoples. Changes in custom and tradition also occur under the outside influence of other nations.

Enumerating the properties of a nation does not yield an exhaustive picture of its essence as a historical community, of its most distinctive features. The whole thing hinges on the peculiar combination, and degree of maturity, of the properties and features. The main features of the Russian and Ukrainian peoples, for example, "so close to each other in language, territory, character and history,"¹ are much the same. Yet Russians and Ukrainians constitute two different nations.

The significance of various properties in the history of different nations is not the same either. For one thing, not every territory has been the natural geographical condition for the formation of a nation, not every economic community forms a nation, and not any degree of cultural development is sufficient for this. The classics of Marxism-Leninism attest that the main components making a nation depend on the historical features of its development, and on the epoch in which it evolved.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 91.

The fact that Lenin attached great importance to the economic basis of a nation, to its "economic property", does not mean that a nation arises on the foundation of a ready-made economic community, only after this community has taken shape. This notion could not be farther from Lenin's conception of economic ties as the factor behind the consolidation of the population of different areas and regions of a country into one nation. In fact, it is in many cases quite contrary to the actual state of affairs.

Noting the economic dispersal and semi-feudalism in the colonies, Lenin still considered many of the oppressed peoples to be nations. "Liberation of the colonies," he wrote in 1916, "means self-determination of nations. Europeans often forget that colonial peoples *too* are nations, but to tolerate this 'forgetfulness' is to tolerate chauvinism."¹

In some countries the emergence of economic community and the emergence of the nation went (or go) hand in hand, complementing one another. The nation was the form in which economic community asserted itself and developed. On the other hand, economic community was the instrument by which the nation united and consolidated itself, and assured progress. This was the case in many West European countries. And the same process may be observed now in a number of Asian and African countries, where economic community does not yet exist by reason of specific historical conditions, but aspirations to national independence, to national statehood, act as one of the factors forming the nation. That nation becomes a form of both political and cultural development and also of economic unification and progress.

* * *

The *typology of nations*—their classification by types and distinctive features—is part of the Marxist-Leninist theory of nations.

The Marxist-Leninist classics defined nations by type according to mode of production or stage of development. They singled out two types of national community—the *capitalist and socialist nations*.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 63.

Capitalist nations are often called *bourgeois* nations by the role the bourgeoisie played in their formation and development. But this is justifiable chiefly for the period of ascendant capitalism, and only partly so for the early imperialist stage.

The deep-going social changes in the successive stages of the general crisis of capitalism, the impact of the October Revolution and especially the emergence and growth of the world socialist system have substantially affected the internal life of capitalist nations resulting in a much more marked differentiation between the proletariat and all working people, on the one hand, and the nation's imperialist bourgeoisie, on the other. The earlier common elements of the spiritual image became eroded, the leading role of the bourgeoisie in the life and development of the nation declined, and the proletariat began playing a steadily bigger role not only in defending national interests against external forces, but also in developing all the truly national—the language, culture and traditions, i.e., all the material and cultural values of the nation.

The objective course of social development has consequently confirmed Lenin's idea, advanced shortly before the October Revolution, that in advanced capitalist countries national community as the determining factor of a nation's unity, the relationship between its classes, "outlived its purpose long ago; *objectively*, there are no 'general national tasks' to be accomplished."¹ The leading place in social development has gone to class antagonisms, as a result of which the class community of people of different nationalities has become more important than the national community of people of different classes, that is, within a nation. "In any really serious and profound political issue," Lenin said, "sides are taken according to classes, not nations."²

Knowing that the processes described above were inevitable, Marx and Engels almost exclusively used the one concept of "capitalist nation"³ in their theory of nations and their analysis

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 20, p. 36.

³ See Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Berlin, 1962, Bd. 19, S. III; K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* (in 3 volumes), Vol. 1, p. 107; Karl Marx, *Capital*, Moscow, 1972, p. 256.

of the development of nations in the period of ascendant capitalism. Lenin, too, used the term time and again.¹ His references to "bourgeois nations"² and "imperialist nations"³ were very few—the former concept for nations of the period of transition from medievalism to capitalism, and the latter only in reference to the beginning of the imperialist epoch or, more precisely, the period of World War I.

The term "capitalist nation" is not only more inclusive compared with "bourgeois nation" but also more appropriate in relation to the term "socialist nation"⁴ introduced by Lenin.

Since nations exist a long time, passing various stages of maturity, they may differ in quality even if they are of the same type. Referring to capitalist nations, for example, Marx, Engels and Lenin used such terms as "highly developed capitalist nation", "capitalistically underdeveloped nation" or "imperialist nation" in contrast to "capitalist nation". The socialist nation, too, has its distinctive qualities when only the rudiments of socialism have been built and in the stage of developed socialism these will undoubtedly be new qualitative changes when developed socialism essentially grows over into communism.

The difference between nations of different types, that is, capitalist and socialist nations, is much more essential, of course, than the distinctive features of nations of the same type. The watershed is in the antithesis of their social, economic, political and spiritual essence, the social structure and the nature of class relations. The socialist nation rises above the capitalist in level of socio-economic, political and cultural development. This it owes to the advantages of socialism over capitalism and also to the preservation and proliferation by the masses of all the economic and cultural achievements accumulated in the capitalist epoch.

Following the transition to socialism, the nation does not lose any of the properties acquired at the stage of its capitalist

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 102, 393; Vol. 3, pp. 64, 66; Vol. 13, p. 77; Vol. 15, p. 229; Vol. 23, p. 60; Vol. 29, p. 190.

² See *ibid.*, Vol. 21, p. 440.

³ See *ibid.*, Vol. 22, p. 342; Vol. 30, p. 153; Vol. 31, p. 241.

⁴ See *ibid.*, Vol. 22, p. 339.

development. These properties remain even when socialist nations develop not as separate nation-states but as part of a multinational socialist state. True, they change radically in class substance, in quality, and especially as regards the relation between the nationally specific and the achievements borrowed from other nations. Alongside the mutation of the properties the nation had before socialism, there also appear new properties. This is the factor which radically distinguishes socialist nations from capitalist. Consequently, the socialist nation is not simply the old national community in the act of developing, but a qualitatively new social community of people, a new form of ties and relations among people.

The capitalist nations are racked by class antagonisms, whereas the socialist nation is distinguished by the unity of basic class aims and interests. As a result, national unity, rooted in international as well as national factors, is entirely different and considerably more enduring. Socialist internationalism runs through the essence of all the policy, ideology and social practice not only of the working class—the leading class of socialist nations—but also of its allies, the working farmers and the people's intelligentsia.

Socialism assures continuity in national culture, national consciousness, psychology, customs and traditions and impels their radical transformation and offers unprecedented opportunities for their improvement. Anti-communist claims that socialism is at odds with the national in the life of peoples, that this national is replaced by the international, are totally groundless. In fact, national factors remain in a changed, more advanced form, facilitating unity and augmenting the collective strength of society. More, the role and significance of national communities become more pronounced, because the national form is aligned with the class content.

Under socialism the national is not reduced to just the surviving elements of the past. It undergoes a complex mutation and development, with many new elements appearing in the consciousness, culture, customs and traditions. These new elements are secured by the nation's achievements in building socialism, the new opportunities of absorbing the achievements of other peoples, and by the fact that the entire national substance is impregnated with internationalism. It is

therefore absolutely wrong to say, as bourgeois ideologues do, that socialism contrasts the international to the national and that this retards national development. The very opposite is true: the international does not obscure the national in socialist society; the national develops and is enriched with the achievements of other peoples on the basis of socialist internationalism. This results in the ascent of the national to the level of the international.

2. NATIONALITIES, NATIONAL AND ETHNIC GROUPS

Marx, Engels and Lenin used the term "nationality" in two senses. Mostly, it was used to connote the historical-social communities of the period from the disintegration of the tribal system to the inception of capitalism and the formation of nations. But the term was also used to mean a people in general, whether a nation, a nationality, a national or ethnic group. Even in the beginning of the 20th century Lenin on several occasions called the Russians a nationality.

The Marxist-Leninist classics named the transition from tribal ties to ties based on territorial community as one of the main and qualitatively new properties behind the emergence of nationalities.¹ In the case of a nationality, unlike the tribe, blood ties and common origin play a far smaller role or none at all. Traditions, too, lose their decisive importance and give place to law. Spontaneously conceived religions fall apart, replaced by new, mainly the so-called world-wide religions practised by many other nationalities, which sanctify and consolidate the class division of society. Every nationality has a definite community of language, though it is often very difficult to trace its genetic connection with the language of the tribes that preceded the nationalities. Besides, the languages undergo substantial changes during the development of the nationalities themselves.

Pre-socialist nationalities are usually far less involved than nations in the general stream of human progress. In fact, Engels described the formation of national community as a

¹ See K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* (in 3 volumes), pp. 192, 327; V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 154.

passage "from locality to nation".¹ The nationality's local exclusiveness derives largely from the specific features of peasant production, from its self-sufficient character in the feudal epoch. Marx stressed specially that "there is merely a local interconnection among these small-holding peasants, and the identity of their interests begets no community, no national bond, and no political organisation among them."²

Though their ethnic properties are conspicuous enough, nationalities and the nations that succeeded them are first and foremost the product of social development. A higher productivity of labour gave impulse to the loosening of clan ties and their replacement by territorial associations. It also gave birth to private property and caused a social differentiation within the clan and tribe. "The old society, built on groups based on ties of sex," Engels wrote, "bursts asunder in the collision of the newly-developed social classes; in its place a new society appears, constituted in a state, the lower units of which are no longer groups based on ties of sex but territorial groups, a society in which the family system is entirely dominated by the property system."³

These processes gave rise to but the first historical form of nationality—the antique, slave-owning nationality. Then, and again due to the elimination of the social impasse of the slave society at the end of its existence, came the medieval, feudal nationalities. Not all of them developed into nations. When feudalism gave way to capitalism, many of them fused into united nations or evolved into capitalist nationalities.

What is the difference between nation and nationality? What does a nationality need to become a nation?

The main conditions for *national* existence, according to Engels, are considerable numbers, one territory, and a developed national feeling, which on the socio-economic plane means a striving for unity and independence. The peoples must be large enough and united and have the capacity for national existence. A nationality's historical activity (necessary for it to become a nation) begins when it has enough strength,

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, p. 65.

² K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* (in 3 volumes), Vol. 1, p. 479.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 192.

enough unity, and the capacity and opportunity, to assure national development in the setting of the world-wide historical tendency towards the assimilation of nations. Lenin, who described these aspirations as a tendency, wrote that it stands for the awakening of national life and national movements, and of struggle against national oppression and for the constitution of national states.¹

Like the nation, a nationality becomes united chiefly by virtue of material relations and interests. But its productive forces, especially under capitalism, are of a lower level than a nation's. So is the degree of the division of labour, and the internal and external intercourse. The economic and political ties of a nationality—which it indisputably possesses at all stages, including the capitalist—are still very loose and more parochial than anything else. This is precisely how the properties of a nationality should be seen: they resemble those of a nation, but are different in quality, in the degree of maturity. In the order of their importance they are: *community of language and territory, burgeoning community of economic, political and cultural life, ethnic self-awareness and customs.*

Consequently, the essence of a nationality is not exclusively confined to the listed number of properties, and derives from their degree of maturity, and this principally in the social, and only in smaller measure ethnic, sense. Furthermore, the role of these properties, and hence also of the nationality, depends on their specific combination, and not simply on their sum. Last but not least, the concrete historical situation in which the nationality develops is highly important: whether its development is free or it is oppressed, whether it is able to establish its state or is a constituent or a multinational state, etc.

Despite rudiments of industry and the inception of a national bourgeoisie, a working class and intelligentsia, their degree of unity and aggregate strength are usually insufficient for the present-day capitalist nationalities to turn into nations. Sometimes, their capacity for independent national existence does not even come into evidence. And where it does awaken partly, the conditions for its materialisation in national development are not always available. This applies, among others, to the Negro nationality in the United States.

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 27.

The development of nationalities in the socialist environment is something entirely different. More than a score of nationalities have already grown into nations in the Soviet Union: they have a basically common economic life, their national cultures are developing, and they have acquired statehood.

Many nationalities in the developing countries are also turning quite rapidly into nations. This occurs, or is at least proclaimed, soon after political independence, though quite frequently a nationality is proclaimed a nation before the objective conditions, principally the economic, political and spiritual ties, are strong and before the nationalities and tribes comprising the population of a country merge into a whole in terms of the main social aspects.

Consequently, the present stage and outlook of the development of nationalities require closer study. Particularly, this concerns nationalities in a socialist or in a mature capitalist society that are unable to become nations due to their numbers and other factors, augmented in capitalist conditions by national oppression and inequality. The level to which these nationalities have already risen is in many cases high enough for us to refer to their *national* development. For understandable reasons, this could not be said of the slave-owning and medieval nationalities until they began to develop into nations.

The conclusion that many present-day nationalities in developed capitalist and in socialist countries are shaping into communities based on national ties, is drawn from the following factors:

- many nationalities are already in the act of growing into nations; others, like the Negro people of the USA, had earlier also developed in this direction, but at present the process has been artificially arrested by monopoly oppression;

- the language of some nationalities has already developed into a written language (e.g., Abkhaz, Khakass), and its territorial dialects have been overcome;

- the nationalities are in the main approaching nations in level of the productive forces, internal communication, division of labour, and cultural progress;

- a national consciousness has already taken shape, though usually in a still insufficiently developed form;

—there is a visible need for political and cultural, as well as material, intercourse with other nations and nationalities in order to absorb their achievements and contribute to world culture.

In socialist conditions all this chiefly concerns relatively small nationalities. In fact, under socialism there is no substantial difference between nation and nationality in the context of national relations. The socialist system affords the nationality the same social conditions as a nation. What obstructs its transformation into a nation—and for some nationalities the barrier is necessarily insuperable—is its limited potential for national development: chiefly small numbers and dispersed settlement. In capitalist conditions the difference in opportunities for the social and national development of peoples is by no means an academic question, because, as a rule, every nationality and many nations face the problem of free development and alien imperialist oppression.

It would not be amiss, too, to examine whether insignificantly small groups (of several thousand, sometimes even several hundred), whose ethnic properties are gradually losing in importance, should be classified as nationalities. The reference is to ethnic groups.

Ethnic groups are communities small in numbers, usually of several thousand or even several hundred people, often dispersed and therefore only loosely connected in terms of social unity, and identifiable almost exclusively by ethnic properties—language, territory, sense of common origin, community of culture, life-style and traditions. In the Soviet Union ethnic groups are communities formed mainly on the basis of primitive tribal groups.

Though many of the ethnic groups have an ethnic bond with their territory, they mostly comprise a minority in its population. Their language (spoken, and this usually only within the family) and elements of culture play a less significant role in their lives than in the case of nationalities. The properties of ethnic groups are most stable within the family, in rites and traditions.

There are some 20 ethnic groups in the Soviet Union, settled chiefly in the Northern Caucasus, the Far North, Siberia and the Far East—Orochis, Olchis, Aleuts, and others.

Ethnographic groups, in many ways similar to ethnic groups, are classed by ethnographers as constituents of nations and nationalities that have in many respects, especially under socialism, merged with them, but still possess some distinctive traits. These also survive chiefly within the family, in intercourse between members of the group. We could name the Svans, Lazes, Mingrels and others who have by now merged with the Georgian nation; the Verkhovintsi, Gutsuls and Bukhovintsi in the Ukrainian nation; Latgals in the Latvian nation, and the Pomors and Kamchadals in the Russian nation.

Ethnic and ethnographic groups are similar in respect to numbers and the significance of their distinctive traits. But the former exist in an environment that differs from theirs in many social and ethnic respects, whereas the latter are in a much more familiar, even native environment. This is why the development of ethnic and ethnographic groups is different. The former are more stable and will exist for a much longer time. The latter will fuse much sooner, or have already begun to fuse, with related nations or nationalities.

National groups are small parts or, as Engels called them, splinters of foreign nations and nationalities. From generation to generation the national features of their members intertwine more and more with those of the nations or nationalities among which they live. Their social and ethnic ties with their own nation or nationality are no more than casual. The 1970 census has established that there are more than 30 national groups in the Soviet Union—Korean, Slovak, Turkish, and so on.

The vast majority of the national and ethnic groups are in many ways inseparable from the nations and nationalities among which they live. First of all, they are small in numbers and, moreover, dispersed not only in the social, economic and political sense, but also culturally. Yet they must be reckoned with; it is impermissible to underrate their significance—first of all the fact that along with nations and nationalities they contribute to the common progress of humanity, the fact that their treatment is a kind of measure of the maturity of a country's political system, and of social relations in general. Engels remarked on the following aspect concerning national,

ethnic and ethnographic groups: "After all, no small benefit derives from the fact that different nations, fully formed politically, usually contain some foreign elements who create a link with their neighbours and introduce variety into the overly monotonous homogeneity of the national character."¹

3. NATIONALITY

The term "nationality" can mean different and often conflicting things. It will be useful, therefore, to examine it more closely.

The Marxist-Leninist classics used the term in different senses—in the sense of "people" as a nation, nationality, a national or ethnic group. Secondly, they used it to mean "a small nation". Thirdly, it was used to characterise the national ties between people and thus to define their national origin, and, fourthly, to characterise the origin of individuals. Now, too, the term is used in all these senses. Yet the meaning in which we use the term "nationality" here applies mostly to *the national bonds of individual people, to the aggregate of traits and properties that identify them with a nation, nationality, national or ethnic group.*

The main properties determining the national identity of people are national ties, whose essence is shaped chiefly by social factors. But ethnic factors, too, which appeared even earlier in history than social ones (the stage of tribe or nationality) must be taken into account. They are very tenacious and people preserve them for a long time even after they have become separated from the main body of their people. Consequently, the nationality of persons is often determined by their self-identification, and hence very subjectively, on the basis of, say, family traditions or origin (Italians in the United States, Ukrainians in Canada, etc.). Objectively, however, people's national identity is in many ways, and sometimes entirely, determined by the social, economic and political ties shaped over the years, rather than by language or territory and ethnic features of culture, customs and traditions, or by ethnic self-identification.

¹ Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Berlin, 1968, Bd. 16, S. 158.

Analysing the crystallisation of populations of different and separate provinces into one nation, Marx and Engels stressed that national bonds appear on a social rather than ethnic basis—in the form of common interests, moral standards and views.¹

Engels held it best to define the national identity of segregated parts of nations and nationalities “by nationality, language and predilection”.² By “nationality” he meant national self-awareness, that is, the individual’s own perception of his national bonds, where social factors play the decisive role. Elsewhere, Engels drew attention to the fact that these splinters of a large nation, “having been separated from its national life, have in great measure integrated in the national life of some other people”.³ Naturally this integration occurs first and foremost in the social context, because the ethnic properties remain the same for a long time. The Hungarian Germans, for example, though they still used the German language, “became real Magyars in spirit, character and custom”.⁴

When the German Reich declared war on the French Revolution, Engels wrote, it did away with the national identity of the people of Alsace-Lorraine, who are of German origin. *Regardless of language and past history*, he said, these German Frenchmen merged with indigenous Frenchmen into one people on the battlefields of the revolution.⁵ Still more incontestable for Engels was the determining role of social in relation to ethnic factors in the case of the Savoyards who, “despite ethnic kinship and a common language”⁶ with the French, chose incorporation in Italy. It was precisely due to their union with Italy that they acquired a distinct national feeling. Referring to language as an ethnic property, Engels pointed out that it “cannot serve as a criterion in settling the question of nationality”⁷, that is, identity with a nation.

¹ See Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Berlin, 1968, Bd. 4, S. 397.

² K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* (in 3 volumes), Vol. 1, p. 343.

³ Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Berlin, 1968, Bd. 16, S. 157.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Bd. 6, S. 170.

⁵ See K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* (in 3 volumes), Vol. 3, p. 411.

⁶ Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Berlin, 1968, Bd. 13, S. 581.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 596.

Lenin held similar views concerning national identity. Referring to the nationality of Alsace-Lorrainers, the majority of whom had favoured incorporation in France, he pointed out that a part of them "undoubtedly incline towards Germany, due not only to language, but also to economic interests and sympathies".¹ The social factors that settled the question of the national identity of this part of the population of Alsace-Lorraine are here singled out quite definitely. Lenin sees origin and identity as independent, though doubtlessly connected, factors in people's lives. In the case of the Swedish and Norwegian nations, which had at one time lived in a common state, Lenin registered their voluntary separation, but noted the "economic and political, the cultural and social *gravitation* of the two nations to each other".² Of course, these factors are doubly valid for people of one nationality. Since national identity is based on the national ties of people, and these ties, as Lenin said in reference to the capitalist epoch, are in substance bourgeois ties, their determining social (rather than ethnic) content is beyond dispute.

National self-identification by individuals does not mean real identity with the nation concerned. As a rule, it is true, people are directly part of the national community. However, many live in a nationally foreign environment, sometimes even in another country, and in fact have no relation to the nation whose name they bear. In such cases, nationality stands for origin (often dating back several generations) rather than identity.

Therefore, the origin of people is not always of equal importance in establishing the national identity. Living in the midst of one's own nation and participating in all its activity, the individual determines his nationality by his social and national bonds and national self-awareness, while his origin and ethnic properties fade into the background. When separated from his nation, national or ethnic group, however, it is precisely origin that for a long time determines his nationality. And here the main part belongs to ethnic factors—the language, ethnic self-awareness, af-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 274.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 24, p. 338.

fection for the cultural values of one's people, customs and traditions.

It follows that determining people's national identity exclusively by ethnic criteria is theoretically incorrect. It is also entirely wrong in the practical political sense. Nationalists deliberately confuse the concept nation as a nationality, and thus include in their nation all people who may have at one time, in the recent or distant past, had ties with it but live in other territories, even in other states. That is what the German Nazis did by including people and the entire populations of neighbouring states in the German nation by virtue of common historical origin. And that is what the zionists are doing by declaring all people of Jewish nationality living in different countries and on different continents, as belonging to their nation. In essence, this is a chauvinist and racist approach.

Besides, if national identity were determined solely by ethnic properties, then in the case of multinational societies and populations of large countries the accent would be on factors that distinguish people rather than those that bring them together. Yet it is clear that people of Russian and American origin living together in some third country have more in common than an American Russian has with a Russian from the USSR, or an American has with an Englishman.

4. THE THEORY OF NATIONAL RELATIONS. INTERNATIONALISM AND NATIONALISM

The theory of national relations defines the forms and content of national relations, examines their concrete types and structures, and the objective laws governing their development.

There are two forms of national relations. First of all, there are the intra-national ties, which are the foundation of a nation's unity. The second form is mutual relations among nations. Of course, they also encompass mutual relations among nations and nationalities, national and ethnic groups.

National relations are one of the most important areas in the clash between the socialist and bourgeois ideology.

The dialectical-materialist interpretation of national relations takes into account the whole set of factors which determine their content and forms—economy, politics, law, consciousness, culture, morality, and psychology.

National relations are based on relations of production, distribution and consumption. Both the content and forms of national relations depend on the material basis of the peoples, on the level of their productive forces. Marx and Engels stressed that "the relations of different nations among themselves depend upon the extent to which each has developed its productive forces, the division of labour and internal intercourse".¹

National relations are in a state of continuous change, depending on changes in the mode of production, on the impact of the policy and ideology of classes and class relations, on the international situation and other factors.

There are many idealistic theories, however, whose exponents try, contrary to the materialist concept, to reduce the essence of national relations to purely psychological factors. Marxists-Leninists do not deny the effect of these factors.² But they hold that national relations refer to the entire life of society, not just the psychology. Yet exponents of psychological theories deliberately divorce national relations from their material foundation.

National relations appear during the transition from feudalism to capitalism in the form of intra-national ties, and will exist as long as nations exist, as long as people possess distinctive national features.

Lenin wrote that one could hardly speak of national ties in the proper sense of the word when there had still been feudal dispersal. National ties succeeded not tribal ties, but territorial unions resulting from growing exchange between regions.³ Commodity production, Lenin pointed out, "*compels* all the individual elements and classes of society to strive to unite, and to unite no longer within the narrow limits of one village community, or of one district, but to unite all the members of the given class *in a whole nation*".⁴ Intranational ties, he added, should never be ignored.⁵

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, p. 32.

² See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 36, p. 606; Vol. 19, p. 499.

³ See *ibid.*, Vol. 1, pp. 154-55.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, pp. 213-14.

⁵ See *ibid.*, p. 227.

Marxism-Leninism distinguishes between two basic types of national relations—capitalist and socialist. However, the content of national relations also depends in large measure on the level of maturity of the respective social systems (formations), the social organisation of the nations, on the class playing the leading role in them and in their mutual relations.

The structure of national relations is predetermined by those fields in which relations between nations take place—the economic, class, political (state), cultural, ideological, and psychological.

The forms and content of national relations, however, are by no means a passive factor in the destiny of the peoples and human progress. Working out the theory of national relations, Marx, Engels and Lenin called attention to the fact that truly friendly relations among peoples are not simply a guarantee of peaceful and neighbourly cohabitation, but also one of the main conditions of progress. Marx wrote: "One nation can and should learn from others."¹ Lenin noted the special importance of mutual confidence. Without confidence, he wrote, especially between workers and peasants speaking different languages, "there absolutely cannot be peaceful relations between peoples or anything like a successful development of everything that is of value in present-day civilisation."²

Capitalist and socialist national relations are diametrically opposite in social content.

The main reason for the antagonistic nature of national relations under capitalism is not the psychology of people, as capitalist ideologists would have us believe, but private property. For peoples to unite, Marx showed, they must have common interests, which are impossible until private property, the source of the exploitation of other peoples, is destroyed. The abolition of private property and the establishment of public ownership of the means and implements of production lays the basis for cooperation and mutual aid among peoples, with national relations becoming friendly.

The national question is, therefore, one of the main expressions of the essence of the capitalist type of national relations.

¹ K. Marx, *Capital*, Moscow, 1974, Vol. 1, p. 20.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 386.

* * *

The national question arose in the late Middle Ages when the burgeoning of capitalism gave impulse to the first signs of national life. National movement encompassing millions of people came into being, initially aimed at tearing down the absolutist feudal barriers to the emergence of nations and national states. Later, when the development of capitalism brought about the division of humanity into a handful of oppressors and a vast majority of oppressed peoples, the national liberation movement gave expression to the aspirations of the oppressed to drive out the oppressors and secure free national and social development.

National liberation movements have always been a most effective means of solving the national question. Also, they have always been closely associated with the struggle of the working masses for social emancipation. In their latter stages, in fact, the social essence begins to predominate in their content. National movements clearly confirm the necessity postulated by the Marxist-Leninist classics of treating the national question strictly in a critical way, recognising its historically conditioned importance.¹

Marxism-Leninism emphasises the importance of a correct approach to the national question. This predetermines its successful solution.

The national question is first and foremost a question of solving vital problems of social development, abolishing national oppression and inequality, eliminating obstacles to the formation of nations and assuring freedom for the development of peoples, including achievement of factual equality and internationalism in national relations. In the capitalist epoch, the national question has been one of the most complicated problems strongly affecting internal national processes, the formation and development of the oppressor, as well as oppressed, nations, and the prospects of the national and social emancipation of oppressed nations. Its influence is still greater on relations among nations, that is on international processes, and on the reflection of these processes in the consciousness of

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 435.

classes, parties and entire peoples. The international processes, impelled by the internationalisation of all aspects of society, become world-wide processes once they come under the direction of the working class, but are still subject to the influence of the national question until it is finally solved.

National and international processes are essentially objective, because they are conditioned by the nature of the social system, the dominant form of property. But they are also connected with such subjective factors as the national consciousness, national psychology, the ideology of internationalism and, in certain conditions, with manifestations of nationalism.

In many ways the national question is a measure of all the internal aspects in the life of nations and of their mutual relations, exercising a strong influence on the economic, political and cultural development of all mankind and of individual peoples in the epoch of capitalism and the building of socialism. The substance of the national question in the capitalist environment is the antagonism between nations, their division into oppressor and oppressed, and the practice of nationalism and chauvinism. National oppression and inequality hold up social progress, and act as a brake on production and exchange, on the mutual influence and enrichment of national cultures. They cause division among people and entire nations, and give rise to hostility, hatred, and wars.

Though the national question is very important, it is not, in the view of Marxists-Leninists, an independent and self-sufficient issue. It is entirely subordinate to the class problems in the development of society. Marxists-Leninists, who are consistent humanists and democrats, set their policy not only on eliminating national oppression and inequality, but mainly on the class interests of the proletariat.

The national aspects in people's lives, in the life of society, are only a form of social development whose content depends on the mode of production prevailing in the respective formation—capitalist or communist (as long as nations and national traits continue to exist in the latter). This is why the national question, and also the entire problem of the development of nations and national relations, are so clearly subordinate to the class question. The solution of the national

question, therefore, is impossible without deep-going social transformations. That is a Marxist-Leninist postulate. "National question," wrote Lenin, "must be viewed historically and economically."¹

The proletariat's main stake in national relations is to work out a truly revolutionary policy based on a correct analysis of the national and international processes of the capitalist epoch, and thus assure mutual confidence among the working people of all nationalities, their rapprochement and unity in the class struggle for emancipation and socialism.

The proletariat is objectively international by nature, interests and aims. However, this does not make it less necessary for the Marxist-Leninist parties to concern themselves with the internationalist education of the working class, all working people. Doubly so, because the bourgeoisie is trying to subdue the role of internationalism and is cultivating nationalist ideology among the masses. The working-class party combines educational work with consistent efforts to eliminate national oppression and inequality, to secure free national development for all downtrodden peoples. The dialectics of the Marxist-Leninist approach to the national question, CC CPSU General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev said, is to advance to "cohesion, unity, and the all-round integration of nations through their complete liberation from social and national oppression, through the creation of the most favourable conditions for the development of each nation."²

Lenin condemned attempts to identify internationalism with nihilism towards national elements in the life of peoples. True internationalism, he pointed out, means the fullest consideration of the national factors in the development of society, while combating national exclusiveness, all forms of isolation, and promoting fraternal unity, cooperation and mutual assistance.

Nationalists exalt national exclusiveness, the superiority of their own over other peoples. They propagate chauvinism and racism, sow hostility and hatred among peoples, and organise

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 41, p. 313.

² L. I. Brezhnev, *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, pp. 10-11.

armed clashes and conflicts. All this is a great impediment to social and economic progress.

Though the essence of the national question is the same everywhere, the forms it takes are extremely varied. They depend on the degree of maturity of capitalist social relations, the distinctive features of the country, and the like. The national question has existed in history since the time absolutist feudal obstacles for the formation of the first nations were torn down, and will exist until the victory of socialism and the transformation of capitalist into socialist nations in the course of socialist construction.

The national question is solved through the elimination of all types of national oppression, through the assurance of true equality, an equality not only formal but also in fact, through the free and all-round development of nations, nationalities and national and ethnic groups, through the principle of free will in national relations, through assistance by the more advanced nations to peoples trailing in development, and through balancing the content and form of national and international processes with the objective of social progress.

None but the working class can completely solve the national question. Yet the bourgeoisie, too, takes certain steps, first of all for its own purposes and also under pressure of the masses. At the dawn of the capitalist era the bourgeoisie stood at the head of national movements, organised nations and national states, and promoted the national development of peoples. It did so for as long as the growth of nations benefited its own positions.

The situation changed radically in the imperialist period. The bourgeoisie began to fear the progress of its own nation, because this tended to strengthen the position and influence of the national working class. But since there was progress all the same, the bourgeoisie tried to use it for the purpose of plundering and enslaving other peoples. And for this it had to corrupt its own nation with nationalism and chauvinism, and the peoples it oppressed with national nihilism.

In monopoly period of capitalism, the national bourgeoisie of colonies and dependent countries took a conspicuous place

in the mass struggle for a solution of the national question, while the bourgeoisie in the metropolitan countries, frightened by the revolutionary actions of the working class and its allies, fell back on reactionary attitudes, especially so in relation to national movements. In the colonies, however, and also in dependent countries, as Lenin noted in the summer of 1912 when examining the liberation struggle of the Asian peoples, there was "*still* a bourgeoisie capable of championing sincere, militant, consistent democracy".¹ This viewpoint is still correct and valid in regard to many Asian, African and Latin American countries, where the national bourgeoisie is still participating in the battle of newly-liberated or still-to-be liberated colonial peoples against imperialist economic, political and cultural domination.

As long as capitalism is not destroyed, anything the ruling classes do to mitigate the national question is *bourgeois* in substance. No matter how positive the results may be, the solutions are incomplete and are bound to contain negative elements leading to the segregation of the nation and division of peoples in general. Lenin pointed out that as long as capitalism exists, all democratic demands—consequently also the solution of the national question—"can only be accomplished as an exception, and even then in an incomplete and distorted form".²

The basic difference between the proletarian solution of the national question and the palliatives of the capitalist society is that the former is based on the greatest possible *unification* and voluntary *convergence* of the peoples. Solving the national question is part of the workers' historical mission of abolishing capitalism and assuring mankind's passage from capitalism to socialism. Engels wrote, that none but the proletarians were capable of destroying national exclusiveness; none but the awakening proletariat could establish fraternity among different nations.³

Defining the ways and means of solving the national question, the Marxist-Leninist classics laid a special accent on

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 165.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 21, p. 408.

³ See Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Berlin, 1969, Bd. 2, S. 614.

the internationalist education of the workers and all working people. In a multinational country, they pointed out, revolutionaries belonging to oppressor nations must insist on "freedom of *secession*" while revolutionaries of the oppressed nations should, conversely, insist on "freedom of *incorporation*". As Lenin wrote, "there is not, and cannot be, any *other* road to internationalism and the amalgamation of nations, any other road *from the given* situation to this goal."¹

The unity of the proletariat and all working people attained in common struggle and through organisational unity during the revolutionary overthrow of the old system has got to be consolidated by the complete elimination of national oppression after victory. International cooperation "is possible only between *equals*".² This implies genuine freedom of national development for formerly oppressed peoples through consistent exercise of the right of nations to self-determination, respect of national interests, considerate treatment of national minorities, assistance to peoples lagging in their development, etc.

As it progresses, socialism eliminates antagonism among nations and its causative social factors. Everything that could inflate national relations into a problem of such dimensions as to affect the progress of society, disappears.

The national question was solved for the first time in history as a result of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the building of socialism by its peoples.

Leonid Brezhnev stressed: "Summing up the heroic accomplishments of the past half-century, we have every reason to say that the national question, as it came down to us from the past, has been settled completely, finally and for good. This is an accomplishment which can by rights be ranked on a par with the victories in the building the new society in the USSR, such as industrialisation, collectivisation, and the cultural revolution."³

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 347.

² Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Berlin, 1967, Bd. 35, S. 270.

³ L. I. Brezhnev, *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, p. 17.

Certainly, the positive aspects introduced into national relations (cooperation and mutual assistance, mutual influence of cultures, and the like) during the solving of the national question, remain after that question is finally solved. More, with socialism removing the factors that inhibited their development, they grow more strongly pronounced and become a crucial part of socialist social relations, working for man's progress towards communism.

* * *

Marx, Engels and Lenin contributed substantially to the theory of national relations by their perseverance in promoting the revolutionary content of the slogan of the right of nations to self-determination. Lenin complemented it with the slogan of the right to secession not short of forming an independent national state.

The slogan of the right of nations to self-determination, first advanced by the bourgeoisie in the 17th century, had a strong bearing on the consolidation of capitalism's victory over feudalism and on the inception and growth of national relations. Lenin said that "from the standpoint of national relations, the best conditions for the development of capitalism are undoubtedly provided by the national state".¹ The proletariat extended and enriched the progressive content of self-determination, adding to its significance. Lenin stressed again and again that the self-determination slogan had immensely helped the internationalist education of the working class and labouring masses, and weakened the potential of the nationalism of the imperialist bourgeoisie, and also the various nationalist ideas and theories peddled in a socialist wrapping. Exposure of the theoretical falsehood of refined nationalism, and of the reactionary substance of its jingoist variety, ranks among Lenin's greatest merits in conceptualising national relations.

Among other things, he drew a highly important conclusion that "opportunism in the national question will, of course, find expression among oppressed nations otherwise than among

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 400.

oppressor nations".¹ Once the proletarian dictatorship is established, Lenin showed, different nations following the same historical course of building a classless society, do so "by very different zigzags and by paths".² This is also an expression of the qualitatively new stage in the exercise by the peoples of their right to self-determination. Under capitalism it amounted almost exclusively to the right of the peoples to set up national statehood. After the socialist revolution, however, Lenin saw the substance of the matter in the free choice by each people of the most efficacious forms and methods of building socialism and its relations with other peoples.

Under socialism the new content of national relations is largely predetermined by the free and versatile development of all the truly national elements in the life of the peoples. It is bourgeois nationalism, Lenin said, that proclaims development of the nationality in general, thus spawning ideas of exclusiveness and precipitating national strife. The proletariat, on the other hand, even in capitalist conditions, fights for the solution of the national question and for truly free national development, but works perseveringly at the same time for a united revolutionary anti-capitalist front of working people of all nationalities, and does not hesitate to declare that it "welcomes every kind of assimilation of nations, except that which is founded on force of privilege".³

The new character of national relations under socialism has a very strong bearing on the progress of nations. Under capitalism the development of nations is in fact reduced to the unfolding—as far as this is possible in capitalist society—of their intrinsic potentialities, whereas socialism provides for two other important factors. First, mutual influence and enrichment fructifies the development of all national elements in the life of free peoples; the national elements undergo changes to suit the needs and special features of the nation or nationality concerned. Second, the utmost importance is attached to all-round and selfless mutual material assistance, assistance in personnel, experience and cultural values.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 411.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 29, p. 195.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 20, p. 35.

The dictatorship of the proletariat and the building of socialism radically alter the essence of national relations. Here are the distinctive features in the substance of socialist national relations:

- socialism replaces spontaneous development of national relations with conscious guidance by the working class and its party on the basis of Marxist-Leninist science;

- substantive changes occur during the building of socialism in the content and scale of national ties within nations as the basis for the new stage of national consolidation necessary for the victory of the classless society, and for the strengthening of the unity of each nation; conversely, the building and subsequent victory of socialist society stimulate national consolidation, the nation's unity;

- as socialist social relations emerge and gain firm ground, relations between nations, too, become more developed; the friendship of the peoples is born and becomes stronger as nations and nationalities begin steadily to converge;

- socialism asserts equality and the principle of free will in relations between nations and states by abolishing national oppression and exploitation and establishing public ownership of the means of production;

- under socialism national relations accentuate close cooperation and fraternal mutual assistance of the liberated peoples with the purpose of jointly building a classless society;

- the socialist system assures elimination of the factual inequality of large and small peoples inherited from the past, and a steady approximation of the economic and cultural levels;

- proletarian internationalism becomes the theoretical, ideological, moral and psychological basis of national relations, of all the national in the life of the peoples (national statehood, culture, psychology, etc.);

- under socialism the development of nations and national relations is based on steady elimination of great-power chauvinism, bourgeois nationalism, and national nihilism;

- socialism assures respect of national interests and considerate attitude towards national feelings; establishes scientifically determined harmony between the national interests of free

peoples and subordinates secondary and transient interests to the basic and long-term interests;

—by eliminating the social causes of national inequality and promoting the rapid growth of economy, culture and national statehood, socialism assures the collapse of national partitions, convergence of nations, mutual influence and mutual enrichment of their cultures.

The Leninist national policy of the CPSU has clearly shown that these objective processes lead ultimately to radical changes in the content and forms of national relations. "A great brotherhood of men of labour, united, irrespective of their national origins, by a community of class interests and aims," Leonid Brezhnev pointed out, "has emerged and has been consolidated in this country; the relations between them have no equal in history and we have every right to call these relations the Leninist friendship of peoples".¹ This truly priceless gain was one of the motive forces behind the rapid building of socialism and has a crucial bearing on the success of communist construction.

* * *

Many thinkers have tried to sound out the essence of national relations. Some have to a degree even understood their material basis. But it was Marx, Engels and Lenin who distinguished the social and class aspect of the economic, political, cultural, legal and other areas of national relations. The social and class aspect has three planes: a) the relationship of classes within one nation; b) the relationship between the same classes of different nations; c) the relationship of different classes of different nations (e.g., the ruling classes of oppressor nations and the working people of nations oppressed by imperialism; the political alliance of the working class of large and developed nations and the peasants of less developed, including oppressed, nations).

The social and class aspect of national relations in capitalist society is ideologically expressed by the two diametrically

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, pp. 17-18.

opposite world outlooks—proletarian internationalism and bourgeois nationalism. Here is how Lenin defined its main content: "Bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism—these are the two irreconcilably hostile slogans that correspond to the two great class camps throughout the capitalist world, and express the *two* policies (nay, the two world outlooks) in the national question".¹ Bourgeois ideologists try to reduce internationalism and nationalism to mere feelings, to the domain of the psyche. Marxism-Leninism, on the other hand, regards the two opposites chiefly as social factors flowing from the processes of the material and cultural life of society which they in turn influence through the sphere of class and national relations.

The main element of proletarian internationalism is its influence on the class, rather than purely national, relations of proletarians, of all working people, regardless of their nationality, in the form of solidarity in, say, the class struggle, in building the new society or in safeguarding the acquired gains. Certainly, they are simultaneously relations in the realm of the national. Yet their substance is determined by class relations.

The present and future of proletarian internationalism has always hinged on the fact that it was and is the ideology of the working class, the most advanced of the social classes.

To depreciate the significance of proletarian internationalism in the life of nations, bourgeois ideologists exaggerate the impact of nationalism. Even the natural striving of the peoples for national unity, their wish to secure free development and independence, they pass off as nationalism.

The substance of nationalism is rooted in the bourgeoisie's desire to identify national with social unity, to portray the former as a higher form of the latter, and national relations as independent of class relations.

The social and class aspect of national relations also encompasses relations between the same classes of different nations, that is, principally those of the proletariat and of the bourgeoisie. The basic interests of the bourgeoisie of different nationalities do not coincide, except when the power of the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 26.

capitalist class is in jeopardy, because they collide in the drive for profit. The case of the proletarians of different nations is different. Their basic interests, especially in the struggle for emancipation and the building of the new society, are the same. Differences may arise only over transient, temporary issues. That, too, is an important source of the strength of proletarian internationalism, and of the weakness, the doom, of bourgeois nationalism.

Bourgeois nationalism is bred by the rule of private property, the class interests of the bourgeoisie, which tries to pass it off as loyalty to national interests and one of the main criteria of patriotism. But depending on various factors, chiefly the immediate political aims of the bourgeoisie, its nationalism may also take on the dimensions of chauvinism or the form of national nihilism or cosmopolitanism.

Nationalism performs a variety of social functions. In some cases it helps the bourgeoisie of one country to dissociate itself from the bourgeoisie of another, stronger country. In other cases it is a means of mobilising the masses in a bid to retain and reinforce the rule of the bourgeoisie or to conquer foreign territory. Sometimes it is used as an instrument for disrupting the united class front of workers of all nationalities.

Taking many examples from the history of Russia, of other imperialist and of oppressed countries, Lenin demonstrated how the bourgeoisie betrays the national interests of its peoples. Time and again, he wrote, the bourgeoisie betrayed the cause of freedom, the country, language and nation when the revolutionary proletariat stood in its way.

In a world of rivalry between the bourgeoisies of different nations under the flag of chauvinism, Lenin's warning that the working class must fight "the chauvinism of *one's own nation*"¹ is of the utmost value. It applies to both big and small nations, to oppressor and oppressed nations.

Proletarian internationalism is the antithesis of bourgeois nationalism not only in social content and form, but also in influence on the life of peoples and humanity as a whole. Whereas nationalism acts as a brake (save when it facilitates a

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 39, p. 741.

people's unification in the national liberation struggle), internationalism accelerates the development of the peoples.

Proletarian internationalism originates from the requirements of social growth, first as a still vaguely apprehended striving for unity among proletarians, whose material condition and class interests coincide irrespective of nationality. Marx and Engels substantiated the social essence and main principles of proletarian internationalism. Lenin and his followers, especially after the inception of the world communist movement, developed the Marxist propositions into a comprehensive system including not only the principles of internationalism, but also its forms, sphere of application, etc.

Proletarian internationalism is first and foremost an ideology that substantiates in theory and practice the unity of the working class, and of the labouring masses under its leadership, in the following three directions of social development: a) class struggle for liberation from oppression and exploitation; b) revolutionary remaking of society, construction of socialism and communism; c) relations between nations and between states. Apart from philosophical ideas and principles, the substance of proletarian internationalism encompasses the political, ethical, even psychological relation of the working class of one nationality to the tasks it performs jointly with other national working-class detachments in these three areas. Proletarian internationalism is at once the policy and the psychology of the proletariat. Lenin, for example, referred to the "instinct and consciousness of internationalism" and described it as the essence of working-class policy. Internationalism is the lifeblood and practice of the working class and its allies, and thus becomes a crucial social factor of human progress.

Proletarian internationalism took different forms in different stages of social development—from solidarity of workers of one enterprise to joint action by workers of an industry or the entire country to international proletarian solidarity; at first it encompassed only the workers, then its influence spread to their allies in the class struggle, in the building of a classless society; it grew from a factor of every-day consciousness into one of the pillars of the Marxist-Leninist science, the most advanced teaching of our time, and became an instrument

uniting and guiding the Communist and working-class movement, the world revolutionary process.

The reflection of the objective identity of the national elements in the life of the working class and the workers' international interests, proletarian internationalism is the class element in the national. This is why it is a means of combating the corrupting influence of bourgeois nationalism, and at the same time a means of resolving the difficult problem of unity in the ranks of the international working class and the anti-imperialist movement, in the world socialist system and the international communist movement.

There are three factors behind the rising role of proletarian internationalism: a) the continuously growing process of internationalisation, of the development of the productive forces, science and technology, on the one hand, and the direct drawing together of peoples in all areas of relations, on the other; b) the continuously increasing influence of the internationalist ideology of the working class which, as Lenin said, has moved into the centre of the new epoch; c) the steady consolidation of socialism in the world, bearing friendship and fraternity to the peoples, which vastly increases the role and influence of proletarian internationalism. The maturing of objective preconditions for the victory of the proletarian world revolution necessitates closer attention to subjective factors, among which the most important one is unity of all anti-imperialist forces. This unity is possible only under the internationalist leadership of the working class.

It stands to reason that proletarian internationalism does not gain ground spontaneously. It involves serious difficulties, because its triumph is impossible until the reactionary ideology of bourgeois nationalism is conclusively defeated.

Nationalism was a strong weapon in the bourgeoisie's drive for power at the time of the decline of feudalism. Lenin stressed that "the more backward the country, the stronger is the hold of small-scale agricultural production, patriarchalism and isolation, which inevitably lend particular strength and tenacity to the deepest of petty-bourgeois prejudices, i.e., to national egoism and national narrow-mindedness".¹

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 150.

Nationalism, Lenin showed, "passes through various phases, according to the classes that are dominant in the bourgeois country at any given time".¹ At present the manifestations of nationalist ideology are probably still more varied than in the period examined by Lenin. In the United States, for example, we see imperialist chauvinism, the cosmopolitan aspirations of monopoly capital and advocacy of national nihilism, and the worst kind of racism in the form of "white chauvinism", on the one hand, and the "black nationalism" of the extremist elements among the Black population, the national isolation and prejudices of part of the Indians, Puerto Ricans, etc., on the other.

In effect, reactionary bourgeois nationalism also takes the form of cosmopolitanism, a current of bourgeois ideology fashionable in the West at present. In substance, cosmopolitanism is the reverse side of the reactionary nationalism of monopoly capital. In its bid to control smaller peoples, the ruling section of the bourgeoisie of the major imperialist powers tries to persuade the working people of other countries that it is senseless to cling to national values, to freedom and independence. Cosmopolitanism is, in fact, ideological camouflage for foreign domination, the proponents of which seek to gunell the resistance of the exploited peoples. But since the monopoly bourgeoisie oppresses other peoples through the services of part of its compatriots, cosmopolitanism is also aimed at attuning the latter. This is why the idea of a "world state" and "world government" is so intensively cultivated in the United States, and in Europe the reactionary forces campaign for an "integrated Europe" with a supranational government. Bourgeois scientists and politicians, bankers, industrialists and theologians have joined hands to prove that "the age of absolute national sovereignty is over", that it is senseless to cling to national statehood, let alone for the peoples of former colonies to build it from scratch.

The cosmopolitans are, in fact, preachers of national nihilism. In the present stage of human history, they claim, there is no sense in championing national values, which have become an anachronism.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 452.

Capitalist propaganda eulogises the cosmopolitanism of Socrates ("I am no Athenian or Corinthian, but a cosmopolitan"), exploits the universal desire for peace ("the cause of wars is in national sovereignty") and even avers that there is nothing more natural than economic and political integration ("economic communities cease to be nations").

Certainly, cosmopolitanism and national nihilism are no idle mental exercise by people withdrawn from life. They are based on entirely real factors of the present phase of world capitalism or, more precisely, on the interests of monopoly capital. Firstly, national sovereignty and customs barriers hinder the free flow of capital and commodities to and from the major imperialist powers, which is an impediment to greater profits. Secondly, in addition to the many monopolies in individual countries there are now multinational corporations that, in effect, dominate the economy and politics of very many smaller states. Thirdly, with the breakup of colonialism the imperialists are trying to invoke cosmopolitanism and nihilism to undermine the sovereignty of new national states, to disrupt the national unity of their peoples, and thereby strengthen neocolonialism. Fourthly, in a decaying capitalist world cosmopolitanism and national nihilism are instruments whereby reaction intends to unite all its forces now divided by national partitions for struggle against the growing forces of the world revolutionary process.

Cosmopolitans and nihilists often try to claim "affinity" to proletarian internationalism in the national question. However, they are hostile to the Marxist-Leninist ideology in essence, in their aim to block the progress of the peoples. Cosmopolitanism and nihilism advocate "abolition" of nations and national distinctions in this very day and age, through forcible assimilation. Marxism-Leninism, on the other hand, sees the fusion of nations as a natural process, but this only in the remote future and exclusively on the basis of completely free national development.

The struggle between internationalism and nationalism is as inevitably a concomitant of the development of capitalist and socialist societies as the class struggle between the proletariat and bourgeoisie. However, there are periods when, as Lenin pointed out, the situation necessitates "greater attention than

before to the national question" and the elaboration of "consistently Marxist decisions on this subject in the spirit of consistent internationalism and unity of proletarians of all nations".¹ This was true of the period preceding the First World War, and during the war itself. And it is true of today. In the former period nationalism was an important weapon of the bourgeoisie in goading peoples against each other in order to facilitate a redivision of territories through an imperialist war and to prevent proletarian revolutions. At present, the imperialist bourgeoisie resorts to nationalism to weaken the world revolutionary process, to disrupt its unity, and block the transition of humanity from capitalism to socialism.

But whatever separate and temporary successes the bourgeoisie may score by its use of the nationalist ideology, they will not save the capitalist system. The new, socialist system marches forward under the banner of proletarian internationalism, whose victory is certain.

5. THE OBJECTIVE FOUNDATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONS AND NATIONAL RELATIONS

Definition of the laws governing the development of national communities is an important constituent of the Marxist-Leninist theory of nations. The starting point is the Marxist-Leninist postulate on the relative independence of nations and national relations. The national element is only a form of social development, the essence of which is predetermined by the socio-economic system or, more precisely, the economic formation in which nations exist at various stages. Both capitalism and socialism has its own universal law governing the development of nations and national relations.

The first step in substantiating the existence of a capitalist universal law was made by Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto* and other works. They showed the content and forms of the national processes leading to the formation of nations and comprising the essence of their development, on the one hand, and substantiated the law-governed character of

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 250.

expanding relations between nations and the consequent emergence of international processes, on the other.

Projecting the ideas of Marx and Engels and studying the development of the nations of the world in the new conditions, Lenin drew the final conclusion about the existence of a universal law of capitalism in the development of nations and national relations. He wrote:

"Developing capitalism knows two historical tendencies in the national question. The first is the awakening of national life and national movements, the struggle against all national oppression, and the creation of national states. The second is the development and growing frequency of international intercourse in every form, the break-down of national barriers, the creation of the international unity of capital, of economic life in general, of politics, science, etc.

"Both tendencies are a universal law of capitalism. The former predominates in the beginning of its development, the latter characterises a mature capitalism that is moving towards its transformation into socialist society."¹

It follows from Marx, Engels and Lenin and the development of nations and national relations under socialism that there is also a universal law of socialism in this important social domain.

In the early years of Soviet power, Lenin registered the national awakening of the previously oppressed peoples of Russia. In a report on the national-colonial question to the Second Congress of the Communist International he invoked the Soviet experience to conclude that even in areas with pre-capitalist social relations the socialist system inspires "in the masses an urge for independent political thinking and independent political action".² The urge for socialism was the basis for the national liberation movements that erupted in the general framework of the struggle for the victory of the October Revolution, developing subsequently into a massive building of national statehood. Putting into effect socialism's tendency towards the free development of every people, the Communist Party supported their aspirations to Soviet national statehood. "We have granted *all* the non-Russian

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 20, p. 27.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 243.

nationalities *their own* republics or autonomous regions,"¹ Lenin said on the Fourth Anniversary of the October Revolution. Later developments confirmed Lenin's prediction, made before the Revolution, that the variety of political forms generated by socialism, the experience of statehood, will be the basis for the steady progress of the peoples. Socialism's tendency towards the all-round development of nations and nationalities, embodied in a flowering of nations, is now universally recognised. It is recorded in resolutions of Soviet Communist Party congresses and plenary meetings of the Party's Central Committee.

Socialism gives impetus to the revival of nations and nationalities, to free development of internal national processes leading to the formation (or transformation) of national statehood and assuring the economic progress of republics and the progress of national cultures, the socialist content of the national consciousness, the transformation of old and the formation of new socialist nations, and the steady consolidation of their unity.

The practice of socialism has fully confirmed Lenin's ideas and observations relating to socialism's second tendency in the development of nations and national relations.

Even before the Revolution, Lenin pointed out that "only socialism is able to terminate national bickering".² Two and a half years after the Socialist Revolution he recorded the fact that thanks to the new system national strife had almost completely disappeared in the Soviet country. One more of Lenin's ideas formulated before the Revolution—that it is the purpose of socialism to end the fragmentation of humanity into small states and the isolation of nations, to further the convergence and fusion of nations—was also confirmed in a very short period of history. After but three years of Soviet power, Lenin was able to note deep-going processes of convergence among the peoples of Russia, only recently a "prison of peoples". Early in 1920 he wrote in a telegram to Mustafah Kemal of Turkey that the policy of equality and brotherhood, of voluntary alliance, was "strengthening and

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 53.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 19, p. 251.

uniting all the nations of Russia into a great and powerful family", "forming one great whole".¹

Lenin's foreknowledge was fully borne out by the development of socialism in the first few years of Soviet power. His ideas that socialism would facilitate and accelerate the convergence and fusion of nations, and that previously oppressed backward peoples would seek alliance and fusion with the big and more advanced socialist nations, were at first no more than a prediction. But his statement in January 1918 that the peoples strongly aspired to unity with the Russian working class, that they were drawn together by vital interests and by their class consciousness, was already based on the practice of socialism's consolidation.

The consolidation of the powerful Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the emergence and development of the Soviet people as a new multinational community, are based on Lenin's and the Communist Party's conclusions concerning the essence of the main laws governing socialism.

In its new programme, the Communist Party specially emphasised the operation of the two interconnected tendencies of socialism in the development of nations and national relations, and also the importance of considering them when building communist society.

By its very substance, socialism produces the tendency toward the complete equality of nations, their voluntary and close alliance, their mutual trust, their drawing together on the basis of socialist internationalism, the gradual eradication of national distinctions and, finally, the fusion of nations in the stage of mature communism.

Analysis of the manner of operation of the universal law of capitalism and that of socialism, of manifestations of their tendencies, leads to the conclusion that they do not constitute a single law.

The two tendencies of capitalism, Lenin pointed out, constitute a law only if taken together; furthermore, their sum encompasses all the aspects of the development of nations and national relations.

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 52, p. 301 (in Russian).

In substance, these tendencies of capitalism, as well as of socialism, are progressive and outwardly similar in content; the first tendency both in capitalist and in socialist conditions is aimed at assuring the free development of nations, and the second, despite the disparity of the social systems, leads to the convergence of nations, which will gain pace in the stage of mature communism and culminate in fusion. But closer scrutiny will show that the operation of these tendencies, as Marx said, only seems to be "amazingly similar" under capitalism and under socialism. Since it occurs in different historical situations, it yields entirely different results.¹

Despite the objectiveness of these tendencies and apart from the historical situation, their results are affected by what class is in power. When N. Mikhailovsky², for example, tried to infer that national feeling and national hatred are an independent factor reflecting the interests of the nation as a whole, Lenin pointed out that this view only obscured the substance of the matter, because precisely "the very real interests of the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie constitute the principal basis of this hatred".³

We may recall that, describing the two tendencies of capitalism, Lenin said they constituted the two sides of the national question, that is, of the whole development of nations and national relations. Those, of course, are the main directions in which these tendencies operate. But we must also bear in mind that the manifestation of the two tendencies and their possible joint influence on this or that aspect of the development of nations or of national relations, represents an unbreakable unity. Such an approach will give us a better idea of the correlation of the two tendencies.

Referring to the capitalist epoch, Lenin determined that the first tendency predominates in the stage of ascendant capitalism, and the second in its imperialist period. The predomi-

¹ See Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Berlin, 1962, Bd. 19, S. 112.

² Mikhailovsky, Nikolai Konstantinovich (1842-1904)—leading theoretician of liberal Narodism, publicist, philosopher and an exponent of the subjective school in sociology. He waged a bitter fight against Marxism.

Criticism of Mikhailovsky's views appears in Lenin's *What the "Friends of the People" are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats* and other works.

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 155.

nance of one tendency over the other is not due to their substance, but to the features peculiar to capitalism. In its ascendant stage the growth of the productive forces, and consequently the progress of society, were largely tied in with the national consolidation of peoples, the merging of regions, and the emergence of an internal national market.

The impact of these features is substantially less in the imperialist stage. All kinds of economic, scientific, technological and cultural contacts between nations play a much bigger part. The national development of most of the peoples begins, in fact, to impede the consolidation of monopoly and its profit drive. And this makes capitalism's second tendency predominate. The first tendency is often strongly influenced by nationalism, and the second by such of its varieties as cosmopolitanism, the chauvinism of the monopolies of the bigger nations trying to impose national nihilism on the smaller.

The factors behind the correlation of the tendencies under socialism are entirely different. They operate as a dialectical unity: development occurs on the basis of convergence, and leads to convergence; the convergence occurs on the basis of the development of nations, and itself spurs the further deepening of these processes. Both tendencies develop harmoniously, are interconnected and interactive.

By virtue of the nature of socialism and the consequent harmonious operation of the two tendencies, the efflorescence of nations is achieved exclusively through free national development, and is all the greater, the greater is the simultaneous drawing together of nations, especially in the case of a multinational state. The drawing together, for its part, takes place in the setting of equality and free will, and—necessarily—on the basis of free national development and the efflorescence of nations and nationalities.

Examining the correlation of the tendencies of socialism in the development of nations and national relations, it is important to stress that their harmonious operation does not imply any absolute "equibalance". It may seem to be there, but only at first glance. In fact, however, the *leading* part in the correlation of the two tendencies is played by the tendency towards multiplication of links between nations, towards

convergence. But this is not the result of the predominance of this tendency over the tendency towards free all-round national development. Under socialism the tendency towards free national development assures the drawing together of nations not only by the direction of its operation, but also in many ways by its essence.

It should be stressed that all this applies to the manifestations of the two tendencies of socialism as a universal law, and not to all the cases of the latter's operation. The two tendencies do not always necessarily operate with equal force. That depends on the situation, the level of nations, development, the extent of their internal and external intercourse, and other factors.

Elaborating on the postulates of Marx and Engels, Lenin noted that the universal tendency towards the break-down of national partitions, eradication of national distinctions and assimilation of nations becomes stronger with every passing decade, and is one of the most powerful levers in the transformation of society. However, it should not be identified with the convergence of nations as an expression of the second tendency of socialism's universal law in the development of nations and national relations. The historical tendency towards eradication of national distinctions and the assimilation of nations follows not only from the drawing together of nations, but also from the national development of peoples. Still more trenchant is the fact that the foundation of the historical tendency towards the break-down of national partitions, the eradication of national distinctions, consists not only of the development of nations and national relations, but also of the ceaseless economic, political and cultural internationalisation of the peoples. Lenin stressed specially that the *entire* course of society leads to the convergence and fusion of nations.

Looking into the content and forms of the tendency towards internationalisation, we should remember its complex nature. On the one hand, it consists of externally separate processes of internationalisation in production and exchange of material and cultural values—including internationalisation of science, technology and culture, especially in the scientific and technological revolution, and the intensive elimination of national narrow-mindedness. On the other, we see the processes of national relations as such, that is, the reflection of

the above-named phenomena in the mutual relations of nations and nationalities.

The tendency towards the internationalisation of the whole life of the peoples is seen mostly where for various historical reasons peoples have lived within the framework of one state for a long period. In that case, Lenin said, "they are bound to one another by millions and thousands of millions of economic, legal and social bonds".¹ It stands to reason, however, that internationalisation is not confined to multinational states alone; it encompasses the whole of humanity. There were times when a part of mankind—e.g., for several centuries the peoples of the capitalist colonial system—was only slightly or very nonuniformly involved in the process, and obliged to remain an object rather than maker of history. True, the colonialists drew the enslaved peoples into the capitalist world market. But their involvement was always one-sided and contributed little or nothing to their own progress and internationalisation.

The main thing about internationalisation, Lenin held, was the gradual but steady shaping of a single socialist world economy and international culture. The processes involved are highly conflicting, because for a long time they take place in an environment of class antagonism between nations, and then in a struggle between the capitalist and socialist world systems.

The tendency towards internationalisation in all spheres and the concomitant break-down of national partitions, the multiplication of ties among nations, and their convergence—all of this spurred by the continuously growing productive forces—was described by Lenin as unquestionably progressive. But due to the antagonistic nature of capitalism and the egoistic interests of the capitalist class, especially its monopolistic upper crust, in the imperialist period, the convergence of peoples occurred by forcible annexation, enslavement and exploitation.

In the capitalist epoch, national relations develop spontaneously as the blind effect of the laws of production and the economic market, and antagonistic social relations in general. In bourgeois society the only mark of a conscious approach is

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 503.

found among the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist parties. Fighting to overthrow the bourgeoisie, it is the considered policy of the working class to strengthen ties with all working people within the nation and shape truly fraternal relations with workers, the working masses, of different countries and peoples.

By assuring a high degree of political consciousness among the masses, socialism paves the way to scientific guidance of the convergence processes among nations. These become the mainstream of socialist relations between nations. The convergence is impelled by many social factors. To begin with, socialism affords the opportunity to regulate the correlation of the tendency towards free national development and the tendency towards an all-embracing gradual drawing together of nations and nationalities. Furthermore, the character of the national development, the flowering, of nations continuously invigorates their international basis and stimulates convergence. Last but not least, socialism makes for a deeper understanding and use of the specific laws governing the development of nations and national relations under socialism, as well as capitalism.

* * *

The Marxist-Leninist teaching on nations and national relations, enriched by the experience of the CPSU and the world communist movement, is a living thing continuously embodied in the practice of world socialism, the international working-class movement and the national liberation movement. Its triumph, like that of Marxist-Leninist science in general, is the earnest of fresh advances of the world revolutionary process, of the ultimate transition of all mankind from capitalism to socialism.

I. THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN BOURGEOIS SOCIETY

In the capitalist epoch the content of the national question is shaped by the exploitative nature of the bourgeois economic system stemming from the mode of production and distribution, and depends on the level and peculiarities of the historical development of peoples. The growth of the productive forces as compared with those of the feudal system accelerates the rhythm of life and ends alienation, expanding contacts and ties between people of different nationalities. Yet it was capitalism that introduced extreme nationalism and chauvinism, and fanned national hostility and hatred, resulting in sanguinary wars not only over the division and redivision of private property, but also over artificially aggravated national relations.

Marx and Engels were the first to establish conclusively a) the essence of the national question; b) its place in the development of society, and particularly in the class struggle; c) the basic points of the proletarian programme and policy on the national question in capitalist and socialist conditions.

Lenin continued their work. He developed their principles and drew attention to the changes in the internal life and relations of the peoples in the epoch of imperialism and the emergence of socialism. His efforts were centred on determining the objective laws of the development of nations and national relations. He attributed prime importance to the two tendencies of capitalism in the national question, to its transformation into a national-colonial question, to the essence of proletarian internationalism and its significance for the

peoples and their liberation struggle, and to the development of nations and national relations under socialism.

Mindful of the laws of social development, Lenin stressed the following factors in determining the place and role of the national question: a) the peculiarity of the epoch and the historical stage of the development of peoples and national relations; b) the cardinal significance of the economic basis of the national and international processes; c) the changing content of national movements depending on the objectives of the epoch; d) the irreconcilable antithesis of proletarian internationalism and bourgeois nationalism, and their influence on social relations; e) the role of classes and the class struggle in the life of the nation or nationality, and in the structure and content of national relations; f) the relation of the class element to the national element.

Lenin described as progressive the awakening of the masses from their feudal torpor and the accelerated national processes, which brought about the formation of nations and impelled the struggle for sovereignty. The rapid growth of the productive forces in the womb of the declining feudal society placed the bourgeoisie at the head of capitalist progress. In the struggle for power, the bourgeoisie benefited from the objective economic processes, acting at the same time as the stimulator of their development. The national processes resulting in the birth of nations were: improvements in production and a new division of labour; the growth of commerce and the development of territories inhabited by a definite nationality into an integrated economic unit; the greater significance of language as the means of economic and commercial communication within the evolving market, which accelerated the blending of different dialects into a common national language; the birth of the national written language; the growth of national consciousness and the bourgeoisie's use of favourable opportunities for wresting power from the feudal lords and (by pretending to serve "the will of the people") consolidating its supremacy through a national state. Since feudalism put up a frantic resistance, there appeared national movements to eliminate feudal barriers, end the fragmentation of the burgeoning nations, forge their economic and political unity, and assure free development of culture.

The national movements were an unquestionably progressive factor, for compared with feudalism capitalism represented a higher stage of socio-economic development.

The purpose of the national movements was to form national states. They were impelled by powerful economic factors. But there were also other factors, notably political ones. The bourgeoisie, which needed mass backing in the battle against feudalism, opposed the old system (mostly absolutist monarchies) with the greater democratism of the national state, which afforded relatively greater political freedom. Helping to forge the unity of nations in general, this (coupled with economic factors) also hastened the emergence of the proletariat as an independent social force and impelled class struggle for the workers' emancipation.

The economic development of the 17th and 18th centuries prompted the then still progressive bourgeoisie to proclaim the right of nations to self-determination. "When the bourgeoisie was fighting for freedom together with the people, together with all those who labour," Lenin wrote, "it stood for full freedom and equal rights for the nations."¹ Lenin illustrated this point by his examination of the outcome of national movements in the European countries west of Russia and Austria. Out of the 17 states of the region he described the seven big and five "Lilliputian in size and population" states as being "absolutely homogeneous in national composition" (Italy, Holland, Portugal, Sweden, Norway, Spain, Denmark, Luxembourg, Monaco, Marino, Lichtenstein and Andorra), another three as "states with a merely homogeneous national composition" (France, Britain and Germany), and only two of mixed composition (Switzerland and Belgium).²

The situation in Eastern and Central Europe was different. In face of outside dangers, large centralised states encompassing several peoples had arisen there before nations even began to consolidate. Furthermore, capitalism had begun there later than in Western Europe, and consequently the formation of nations began later as well. The conditions for these processes had no longer been as favourable in some cases,

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 91.

² See *ibid.*, Vol. 23, pp. 273-74.

being inhibited by the structures of the usually centralised absolutist states; many peoples were either oppressed or dependent, which was a brake on their advance to capitalism; the bourgeoisie of the oppressor nations took action to curb the national processes of many of these peoples. This was the case with the various peoples of Austria-Hungary, Russia, and the Balkans.

Referring chiefly to these regions, Lenin pointed out that in contrast to the relatively free development of nations and national relations in Western Europe, there were also instances of underdeveloped national movements, large nations formed out of several small ones or to the latter's detriment — the cases of assimilation. Though the end goal of every national movement was to form a national state, there were cases where national movements, especially if motivated by national oppression, did not give rise to aspirations to independence. This was due to the underdeveloped economic factors. In those cases, a people fighting against national oppression in a multinational country, might not want independence, fearing an enslavement by stronger neighbours. Lenin said on this score that "the development of capitalism does not necessarily awaken *all* nations to independent life".¹ Still, they are drawn into national movements, and the working class should support all their progressive objections, knowing beforehand that their purpose is not national statehood, but better conditions for their national development.

The same economic factors that fostered powerful national movements and the formation of nations, also powered the first processes between nations.

The bourgeoisie's struggle for power and the fact that it was the main force behind the consolidation of nations, gave birth to what is known as the national question. Its wish to carry the national movements to the point of self-determination gave rise quite naturally to the problem of relations with peoples from whom it intended to separate its own nation. But that, too, was not all. Capitalism creates economic links between different territories irrespective of their national background. The level of the productive forces, measured chiefly by the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 437.

social division of labour, has a determining effect on the national relations of the population of different regions. Creating ties between nations that make them interdependent, the exploiting capitalist system also breeds oppression of one nation by another.

The fact that feudalism had retarded the national processes was the original cause of national movements at the junction of the two socio-economic formations. The second cause was the enslavement of peoples by the capitalist class for the sake of greater profits. The relation of domination and subordination became central in bourgeois national relations. However, the profit motive was not the only one for enslaving weaker peoples. Marx and Engels observed that the bourgeoisie was also motivated by the aim of strengthening its hold on its own people, because bourgeois society is then sustained not only by the labour of the national working class, but also by profits derived from oppressing other peoples. This tends to corrupt the working class of the metropolitan country and to dampen its struggle against the capitalist class. Marx and Engels took the example of England to illustrate this point. They showed the direct relationship between the liberation of a people and the liberation of other peoples from the oppression of its bourgeoisie. Engels pointed out that no nation can be free while it oppresses other nations.¹ Marx echoed this thought: "Any nation that oppresses another forges its own chains."²

Marx and Engels saw that the causes of national oppression and inequality stemmed from the rule of private property, from the capitalist system and its class structure. The property relations that prevail under capitalism, Marx noted, give rise to the exploitation of one people by another. Hence the conclusion by Marx, Engels and Lenin that the struggle against national oppression and inequality should be part of the general struggle for the abolition of private property and exploitation. For the working class and its party the national question is part of the general struggle for the overthrow of capitalist rule. In other words, it is not an independent or self-sustaining issue, it is subordinate to the interests of the

¹ See Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 4, S. 417.

² K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* (in 3 volumes), Vol. 2, p. 176.

struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution and the building of a classless society.

Another important facet of national relations under capitalism was the appearance of colonialism. Weaker peoples had been conquered and enslaved by stronger ones also before the capitalist era. Colonial policy, Lenin noted, had existed "before the latest stage of capitalism, and even before capitalism".¹ He cited the "colonial policy" of the Romans. But the degree of enslavement became immeasurably greater in capitalist times. The birth of capitalism and its penetration into the more backward regions of the world, Marx said, was inscribed in the annals of humanity with fire and sword. The variety of forms of plunder and extermination, of merciless exploitation, devised by capitalism became the basis for the conservation of backwardness in these regions for a number of centuries. In the history of Asian, African and Latin American peoples capitalism was the agent that conserved feudalism, often even primitive tribal relations, and this slowed national and international processes to a point where countries, even continents, were in effect excluded from the general course of human progress.

The first racist theories made their appearance in the 16th century, at the dawn of the colonial era, to deduce the inferiority of the backward peoples. The Christian church, governments and bourgeois law began to sanctify racism. Bourgeois ideology backed them up, accentuating the enslaved peoples' lack of opportunities, and even ability, to develop their material and spiritual culture.

This is a general outline of the substance of the national question during the rise of capitalism.

It stands to reason that the content of the national question was not immutable. Take the example of Austria. In the initial stage of the 1848 bourgeois revolution that engulfed many European countries, the Czechs and Hungarians were among those who fought for national independence. The Czechs failed in their bid, because they staked their future on help from the Russian tsar, then the gendarme of Europe. In fact, they became Russia's ally. As a result their national movement

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 260.

came into conflict with the progressive struggle of the many other peoples striving for the victory of their revolution. The struggle of the Hungarians, on the other hand, was drowned in blood by tsarist Russia.

Soon thereafter, the Germans, who had earlier claimed a place of predominance in Austria, formed an independent national state which, together with Russia, imperilled the national survival of the smaller peoples of Eastern and Central Europe. This, Lenin pointed out, created a unique situation: at first the Hungarians, then also the Czechs, gave up all thoughts of secession and campaigned for Austria's integrity, for unity with her—precisely to safeguard their national existence, which was likely to be wiped out by the other, more predacious and stronger neighbours.

Since the epoch of bourgeois-democratic revolutions and the related national movements in Eastern Europe came much later than in Western Europe, Poland, nationally oppressed by Russia, Austria and Prussia—which had divided its territory—was practically the only country to be drawn into the succession of 19th-century bourgeois revolutions. The bourgeois democratic-agrarian revolution was closely linked there with the national question. Marx and Engels supported the dedicated struggle of the Polish people for national liberation, in which the Polish gentry had at first ranged itself alongside the bourgeoisie and the working people.

But by the end of the 1890's the revolutionary storms in Europe abated. And when the Polish Socialist Party, which professed to be socialist and even Marxist, continued to summon the people to fight Russia for Poland's independence, but did not call for joint struggle by Polish and Russian workers, the true Marxists, notably Lenin, opposed that policy as contrary to the spirit of Marxism and at variance with the changes in the class and historical background of the national question.

What had changed? To begin with, the content of the epoch: the period of revolutions in Europe was over, reaction was triumphant, and ascendant capitalism had given way to decaying capitalism. The historical situation in Poland had also changed, and she was no longer the outpost of European democracy. Her dominant classes that had earlier fought for

national independence by the side of the people, had now in fact joined hands with the ruling classes of the oppressor-states—Russia, Germany and Austria.

The effort of the end of the 19th century to detach Poland from Russia was misconceived, because the historical fabric of the Polish question had changed, and because its initiators had abandoned the class standpoint, blotted it out with chauvinism and disrupted the unity of the political struggle. Professing fidelity to its earlier Marxist slogans, the Polish Socialist Party insisted on the need to continue the struggle for secession from Russia, which it said would weaken tsarism, yet left the job of deposing the tsar to the Russian workers alone. Its nationalist leaders refused to acknowledge the new important fact that this time a revolution was maturing in Russia and that Petersburg rather than Warsaw had become the seat of revolution. They refused to acknowledge the fact that the national liberation of the Polish people was no longer a matter to be settled in Poland, but through the revolutionary unity of Russian and Polish workers, and first of all through the victory of the Russian revolution. Lenin said that the Polish Socialist Party was sacrificing the vital interests of the proletariat to its bourgeois-democratic conception of national independence.

All the same, despite the changed historical content of the national question at the time of ascendant capitalism, despite the acquisition of colonies by the great powers and the enslavement of peoples by other peoples in the "civilised" world as well, the national question was still largely an *internal* question. And the relation of the national to the international in the context of the two tendencies of capitalism gave precedence to national processes. As Engels pointed out, nations were not only entitled but also obliged to be national before they could become international.¹

In the imperialist times the situation changed. The national question became a *world* issue. Imperialism, Lenin observed, undermined the basis of the national state, because the wish to keep it nationally isolated, especially from stronger states that could penetrate the internal national market and exploit its people, had become meaningless. By its economic and

¹ See Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 35, S. 271.

political nature, the capitalism of the imperialist epoch *transcends* the framework of the national state, becomes cosmopolitan and, depending on its economic, and accordingly military, power strives to enslave more and more countries. This is why Lenin called the division into oppressor and oppressed nations the *substance* of imperialism in the national question, stressing that oppression by the handful of great powers was steadily increasing.

In the imperialist stage, capitalism created a vast colonial empire and thrived on the profits accruing from the exploitation of colonial peoples. The national question became a national-colonial question, and, Lenin said, imperialism in content signified oppression of nations on a *new* historical basis.

That the locus of national movements shifted from Western to Eastern Europe, coupled with the awakening of Asia, was the new element in the content of the national question under imperialism. The fact that Russia became the centre of the world revolutionary movement, and the first Russian revolution of 1905-1907, gave especially great impetus to the development of national movements in these regions. "In the Western countries," Lenin wrote in 1916, "the national movement is a thing of the distant past. In England, France, Germany, etc., the "fatherland" is a dead letter, it has played its historical role, i.e., the national movement cannot yield here anything progressive, anything that will elevate new masses to a new economic and political life.... The position is different in Eastern Europe. As far as the Ukrainians and Byelorussians, for instance, are concerned, only a Martian dreamer could deny that the national movement has not yet been consummated there, that the awakening of the masses to the full use of their mother tongue and literature ... is *still* going on there."¹

Lenin made a thorough analysis of imperialism's colonial system and its effect on the development of nations and national relations in capitalist society in his book *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, listing the colonial possessions of the great powers (in mln sq. km. and mln. inhabitants) in the following table:

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 39.

Colonial Possessions of the Great Powers¹

	Colonies				Metropolitan countries		Total	
	1876		1914		1914		1914	
	Area	Pop.	Area	Pop.	Area	Pop.	Area	Pop.
Great Britain	22.5	251.9	33.5	393.5	0.3	46.5	33.8	440.0
Russia	17.0	15.9	17.4	33.2	5.4	136.2	22.8	169.4
France	0.9	6.0	10.6	55.5	0.5	39.6	11.1	95.1
Germany	—	—	2.9	12.3	0.5	64.9	3.4	77.2
United States	—	—	0.3	9.7	9.4	97.0	9.7	106.7
Japan	—	—	0.3	19.2	0.4	53.0	0.7	72.2
<i>Total for the Six Great Powers</i>	40.4	273.8	65.0	523.4	16.5	437.2	81.5	960.6
Colonies of other powers (Belgium, Holland, etc.)							9.9	45.3
Semi-colonial countries (Persia, China, Turkey)							14.5	361.2
Other countries							28.0	289.9
<i>Total for the world</i>							133.9	1,657.0

Lenin attached special importance to the awakening of the Asian peoples. "World capitalism and the 1905 movement in Russia," he wrote in May 1913, "have finally aroused Asia."² Elsewhere he noted that the world witnessed a swift upsurge of the national liberation movement, and its "repercussions" on Europe.³

The operation of the two tendencies of capitalism in the content of the national question and the correlation of the national and international, underwent considerable changes in the imperialist period. The development of the productive forces and the requirements of exchange gave momentum to a natural convergence of peoples and tended to destroy national barriers. Capitalism imposed this convergence by force. Instead of equal cooperation there was subjugation, oppression, plunder and enslavement of weaker peoples by the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 258.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 19, p. 86.

³ See *ibid.*, Vol. 18, p. 584.

stronger. National relations between the large civilised powers, too, were reduced to irreconcilable rivalry, which culminated in sanguinary wars.

The operation of the first tendency of capitalism in the national question (awakening and development of peoples, formation and consolidation of their national statehood and sovereignty) was, in effect, just as contradictory. In the imperialist phase, national processes were mostly slow—compared with the general acceleration of social development—and often distorted (one-sided economic development, reactionary trends in culture, almost complete monopoly of culture by the dominant classes, etc.).

Take national statehood. Following the bourgeois revolution in Austria (1848-1867) there was nothing in the general capitalist development or the national processes of her smaller peoples that impelled the kind of leaps in the social domain that could give rise to new nationally-independent states.

This was due to more than just the deceleration of national processes in view of the more contradictory development of capitalism, with the result that revolutionary transformation became the main issue in multinational countries. The weight of international factors in general, and of the world situation in particular, had become greater, and so had their influence on national processes.

Imperialism aggravated national antagonisms to the extreme. It slowed up the national processes, inhibited the peoples' urge for independence and impeded the formation of national states. While breaking down national barriers, mangling nations and pushing assimilation, imperialism did its utmost to prevent ties between working people of different nationalities, deliberately provoked clashes between peoples and countries.

The contradictions which imperialism introduced into the content of the national question changed the part played by statehood in the life of peoples. Having come to power with the support of the masses, the bourgeoisie had at one time introduced democratic principles—universal suffrage, parliamentarism, and the like. But on replacing pre-monopoly capitalism, imperialism stood for savage reaction all down the

line. The bourgeoisie moved away from the working people, and its monopoly stratum from the middle sections of the bourgeoisie itself. In effect, the nation broke up into two, with the reactionary bourgeoisie at one pole, leading on the monopolies, trusts, and the power of the state, and at the other pole the bulk of the population, whose progressive elements tried — naively at first — to fight against monopoly through the democratic institutions of the state. But monopoly soon gained complete sway over the state, giving birth to state-monopoly capitalism.

In the imperialist epoch nations are not just socially heterogeneous, but also culturally dual. The bourgeoisie and the middle strata dependent on it stand together under the banner of nationalism and reaction, while the proletariat and growing numbers of other working people line up with internationalism and democracy.

Lenin examined the antithesis of the proletariat and bourgeoisie, the two main classes of modern capitalist society, and studied the dichotomy of the national culture of each nation.

The duality of nations in imperialist conditions does not mean that nations have begun to go off the stage of history. In 1866 Marx ridiculed Paul Lafargue and his followers for saying that nationality, and nations as such, were an "outdated prejudice". In 1916, Lenin noted that the "Vperyod" group had understood nothing in the historical character of nations.

Lenin warned against exaggerating the significance of the national question in relation to the class aspect. Yet he also warned against underestimating it, especially in the case of oppressed peoples. At the beginning of the First World War, for example, he said that for the revolutionary Marxists of Russia "it would be unseemly ... to forget the immense significance of the national question".¹ Not only because Russia was a "prison of peoples", but because the struggle of the proletariat of Russia over the national question had a special bearing on the awakening of the oppressed peoples of the East. In 1916, when the first stage of the general crisis of capitalism

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 102.

had already begun, Lenin again stressed the significance of the national question in the period of decaying capitalism, saying that it was "extremely important in itself as well as in its relation to imperialism".¹

The national question in the imperialist times was a sphere of life and growth that still had a whole epoch of progressive development ahead of it. And this would be assured by the proletariat. There we have the reason why Lenin devoted to it so much interest and attention. It was chiefly a question of using national movements for the purpose of promoting socialism. Noting, for example, that national liberation movements were a "living and progressive reality", Lenin pointed out that their fusion with the class struggle of the proletariat would pave the way to the victory of socialist revolutions in colonies, as well as in metropolitan countries. The awakening of Asia and the beginning of the working-class struggle for power in Europe, Lenin said, was the beginning of a new phase in world history.

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 22, p. 268.

CHAPTER TWO

**THE WORKING CLASS AND THE NATIONAL
QUESTION.**

THE LIMITS TO ITS SOLUTION UNDER CAPITALISM

Marx and Engels wrote that the working class would play the decisive role in solving the national question. At the end of 1845 Engels said that since the proletariat had the same interests in all countries and was by nature free from national prejudice, it was the only class that could "destroy national exclusiveness ... establish the fraternity of different nations".¹ But the working class must know exactly how much it can do under the capitalist laws of social development, on the one hand, and the ways and means of compelling the bourgeoisie to concede ground in heeding the will of the peoples, on the other.

It was the capitalist development of society that created the national question. Despite the complex and contradictory growth of nations and national relations under capitalism it also enabled the peoples to make substantial headway towards its solution. National relations in a country depend largely on how consistently bourgeois democracy is exercised. The advanced countries, Lenin wrote in May 1913 in a reference to Switzerland, Norway and other lands, "provide us with an example of how free nations under a really democratic system live together in peace or separate peacefully from each other."² Outlining the place of the national question in society and helping the working class frame its policy of national relations, Lenin stressed that "there is only one solution to the

¹ Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 2, S. 614.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 91.

national problem (insofar as it can, in general, be solved in the capitalist world, the world of profit, squabbling and exploitation), and that solution is consistent democracy.

"The proof—Switzerland in Western Europe, a country with an old culture and Finland in Eastern Europe, a country with a young culture."¹ He pointed out that Switzerland, Belgium, Finland and other countries provided the model of a national solution "in *bourgeois* society",² not a universal model.

Lenin's references to a "solution" of the national question under capitalism were at all times conditional. What he meant was an essential consolidation of nations, the formation of nationally homogeneous states, and certain advances in democratising national relations: a solution of questions that arose during the transition from feudalism to capitalism. In the countries he referred to, the national question had ceased to be the main issue in the immediate stage of the revolution, though it was still a battlefield for the progressive forces to secure the best conditions possible in capitalist society for the free development of national and international processes.

The advances in settling the problem of relations between nations were insignificant, because, firstly, consistently democratic changes occurred in only a few countries (Switzerland, Sweden, Belgium); they were exceptional, incomplete, and distorted. Secondly, as Lenin pointed out, it was only a *small step* towards peaceful, truly democratic national relations, and this only *in comparison* to other countries, where the problem was dealt with differently. In Western Europe there were signs of an, albeit incipient, democratic *bourgeois* solution, whereas Russia's ruling classes obviously stood for a *feudal*, that is, candidly reactionary or *bourgeois-liberal*, solution only scantily covered with a democratic fig leaf.

Lenin drew attention to the fact that in capitalist conditions the extent of the solution of the national question depended on the degree to which it coincided with the main issue of the impending stage of revolutionary transformations. The main issue of the 1848 bourgeois revolution in Germany, for example, was precisely the national question: unifying a

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 20, p. 22.

² See *ibid.*, Vol. 41, p. 320.

country feudally divided into 39 parts. In Russia, on the other hand, the agrarian or, more precisely, the peasant question, was the main issue of her capitalist advancement.

Bourgeois democracy, Lenin pointed out, had always and everywhere promised equality of races and nationalities. But it had not, in effect, enforced such equality, and could not have done so due to the domination of capitalism.

Taking guidance in the Marxist-Leninist teaching, the working-class party drew up a truly revolutionary programme of solving the national question, and fought for its implementation even while capitalism was still dominant. The essential point was Marx's and Engels' postulate that the national question is to be viewed through the prism of the class struggle. Lenin complemented this objective: "We must *link* the revolutionary struggle for socialism with a revolutionary programme on the national question."¹

In the capitalist framework the solution of the national question can only be bourgeois-democratic. But even so, it has a bearing on the subsequent solution of social and national problems. Marxists-Leninists must therefore fight "for the utilisation of *all* national movements against imperialism for the purposes of the socialist revolution."²

The working class fights for the elimination of national oppression, for the equality of all nations and nationalities, principally in the interests of consistent democracy. Its national programme is part of the struggle to end oppression in general. Also, its struggle for the best possible solution of the national question is connected with the struggle for its own emancipation. "We would be very poor revolutionaries," Lenin said, "if, in the proletariat's great war of liberation for socialism, we did not know how to utilise *every* popular movement against *every single* disaster imperialism brings in order to intensify and extend the crisis."³

The national liberation movements are only part of the mass struggle against capitalism. The proletariat must use them to reinforce its own onslaught against the old system. Quite

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 408.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 22, p. 343.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 22, p. 357.

frequently, national liberation fighters are far removed from socialism. The actions of smaller peoples *per se* do not destroy capitalism. But in the dialectics of history, Lenin pointed out, "small nations, powerless as an *independent* factor in the struggle against imperialism, play a part as one of the ferments, one of the bacilli, which help the *real* anti-imperialist force, the socialist proletariat, to make its appearance on the scene."¹ The social revolution, he said further, is inconceivable without uprisings of small nations in the colonies and in Europe, and without the non-proletarian masses moving against all types of oppression. This is why the workers' demands concerning the national question become part of the general democratic programme.

Proletarian support of the liberation struggle of oppressed peoples gives added sweep to the people's struggle against capitalism. It should also be borne in mind that peasants, the natural allies of the proletariat, play a substantial role in national movements.

The main aim of the proletarian party's national programme in capitalist conditions is to build a united revolutionary front of working people of all nationalities. It is achieved by different ways. The first and most important is international unity of the proletariat and consolidation of its leading role in the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples. The workers' role as organisers must be buttressed with a theoretically mature programme on the national question and correct political slogans summoning oppressed peoples to fight under the proletarian banner.

Radical democratic changes in the national question under capitalism will ease the condition of oppressed peoples. But apart from securing consistent democracy, it is equally important for the proletariat to secure favourable conditions for the education and organisation of working people, preparing them for a socialist revolution.

Oppressed and deprived of the means of production, the working class in a capitalist society can exercise only a limited influence on the national issue, chiefly in the ideological and political domains, though there, too, the bourgeoisie is

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 22, p. 357.

predominant. Still less is the proletariat's capacity to influence the national and international processes through material production or state apparatus. Yet some opportunities do exist, and it is very important to use them well. Firstly, as Lenin said, the working class, even before emancipation, "economically dominates the centre and nerve of the entire economic system of capitalism"¹ as the producer of most of the material values, as the most advanced and organised class engaged in industry, the leading and continuously renewed branch of the economy. Secondly, "the proletariat expresses economically and politically the real interests of the overwhelming majority of the working people under capitalism"². Thirdly, even before the revolution the working class is able to contribute to the solution of the national question through international organisations of working people.³

But before the proletariat can play any part in solving the national question it must constitute itself as a class. "We are interested, first and foremost," Lenin stressed, "in the self-determination of the proletariat within a given nation."⁴ Not until then can the proletariat mount the struggle to remove the bourgeoisie from power. Then there follow many different stages. Marx and Engels drew attention to this important aspect. Referring in 1844-1845 to the English nation, the most bourgeois of all at that time, Engels pointed out that its bourgeoisie and proletariat were "two radically dissimilar nations...".⁵ As the class struggle became more intensive, so did the struggle for leadership of the nation.

Due to the peculiar development of the working-class movement in England, the proletariat set out to win leadership very late in the day.

In other countries, the struggle had been much more active. Soon after the 1848 revolution or, more precisely, as a result of Louis Bonaparte's coup d'état in December 1851, Marx pointed out, the bourgeoisie in France "had already lost, and

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 274.

² *Ibid.*

³ See *ibid.*, Vol. 35, p. 85.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. 20, p. 428.

⁵ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 420.

the working class had not yet acquired, the faculty of ruling the nation".¹

A mere two decades later, the situation changed. The Paris Commune, the first proletarian revolution in history, was a bold attempt to assume leadership, to restore the nation's unity under the banner of the working class, to eliminate the bourgeoisie. As a result of the Paris Commune, Marx said, "the unity of the nation was to become a reality by the destruction of the State power which claimed to be the embodiment of that unity independent of, and superior to, the nation itself."²

The bourgeoisie had proclaimed liberty, equality and fraternity during its battle against feudalism. It proclaimed national interests above class interests (at least for so long as they coincided with its own and for so long as it needed unity of the nation to consolidate its rule). But sensing the growing peril to its survival from the proletariat, it began to have second thoughts. Take the example of the French bourgeoisie. When revolution loomed in Paris in the autumn of 1870, it changed its behaviour. "The French bourgeoisie," Lenin said, "without a moment's hesitation made a deal with the enemy of the whole nation, with the foreign army which had ruined its country, in order to crush the proletarian movement."³ The Paris Commune was struck down by the French bourgeoisie in alliance with the Prussian militarists.

And later, too, the bourgeoisie showed time and again that it put its class interests above those of the nation.

The more "international" capital became and the more shaky the power of the bourgeoisie, the fewer inhibitions did it show in betraying the interests of its nation. Only in the colonies and dependent countries of the imperialist epoch did the national bourgeoisie still remain progressive. Lenin pointed out that while the Western bourgeoisie—faced by its gravedigger, the proletariat—had come to the final stage of decay, the bourgeoisie in the colonies was still taking part in the struggle for the democratic development of its people. But as the colonies advanced along the capitalist way, its democracy

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* (in 3 volumes), Vol. 2, p. 219.

² *Ibid.*, p. 221.

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 37.

gradually diminished, and there appeared a compradore bourgeoisie. But so long as such democracy is still in evidence, the working class in the colonies and the metropolitan countries must take it into account in its fight for national leadership.

The proletariat is fully equipped to win the bulk of the nation, and isolate the bourgeoisie. But usually that takes time and effort. It is in the long class struggle that the workers prove to the non-proletarian sections of the people that they have a bigger stake than the bourgeoisie in true national liberation. It was not until the early 20th century, Lenin said, that the proletariat, leading the democratic peasantry behind it, came forward as the force which could repulse the antagonists of the oppressed peoples' aspirations to freedom.

The proletariat's drive to win the masses gained special intensity in the epoch of imperialism, the synonym of the most brutal kind of reaction. The struggle for democracy came into the focus of society, and the confrontation between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the people as a whole compelled widely varying sections, including the petty and even part of the middle bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia and other groups, to join in a united anti-monopoly front. The slogans of consistent democracy brought together the proletariat and the advanced democratic elements of all nations. In the struggle, the proletariat advanced alongside other democratic slogans its own revolutionary programme on the national question. Its main content is unity of the working people of all nations in the class struggle; final elimination of national oppression and inequality; free development of nations and nationalities.

Not until the eve of the socialist revolution, when the proletariat at last had a revolutionary political army and the general democratic struggle became increasingly massive, did the bourgeoisie lose its leading role in the life of the nation. In Russia this occurred in September 1917, shortly before the October Revolution. On October 1, 1917 Lenin pointed out that in all cardinal matters "the proletariat truly represents the *whole* nation, all live and honest people *in all* classes".¹

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 99.

The bourgeoisie and proletariat use diametrically opposite means to win the masses. The former falls back on nationalism and chauvinism, while the working class rallies the sound forces of the nation under the banner of internationalism.

While fighting bourgeois nationalism as a thoroughly reactionary ideology, the proletariat recognises that nationalism may have a democratic content when pitted against national oppression even if the liberation struggle is headed by the national bourgeoisie. The working class may even support nationalistic movements, but only for so long as their nationalism plays a positive part in the drive for general democratic objectives. Lenin said that the proletariat should not go farther than that, because from that stage on the bourgeoisie begins to invigorate nationalism and divide the workers and people. During general national movements, he said, the proletarian policy towards the bourgeoisie must be a strictly class policy. "The proletariat's policy in the national question (as in all others)," he amplified, "supports the bourgeoisie only in a certain direction, but it never coincides with the bourgeoisie's policy." In short, its support is conditional.¹

By using the general democratic content of the nationalism of oppressed nations, the working class unites all fighters against national oppression, forging the unity of the working-class and national liberation movements under democratic national slogans. That is of prime importance. Furthermore, the proletariat's struggle against imperialism benefits from the national consolidation of oppressed peoples and the emergence of nationally independent states.

The national demands of the bourgeoisie and proletariat, especially regarding the question of secession, are entirely different. The bourgeoisie imposes these demands on the working people as unconditional. In the case of the working class they are aligned with the interests of the class struggle. "Theoretically you cannot say in advance," Lenin explained, "whether the bourgeois-democratic revolution will end in a given nation seceding from another nation, or in its equality

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 20, p. 409.

with the latter; *in either case*, the important thing for the proletariat is to ensure the development of its class. For the bourgeoisie it is important to hamper this development by pushing the aims of its 'own' nation before those of the proletariat."¹

The working class uses the democratic aspects of national movements, laying a special accent on the general national objectives. When imperialism began to emerge, these objectives were pursued by national movements in Eastern Europe (Austria, the Balkans, Russia) and all the colonies and semi-colonies. "In those areas, as a rule, there *still* exist oppressed and capitalistically undeveloped nations," Lenin wrote in 1916. "*Objectively*, these nations still have general national tasks to accomplish, namely, *democratic* tasks, the tasks of *overthrowing foreign oppression*."²

Asking himself which national movements favoured the workers' liberation struggle most in the imperialist epoch, Lenin looked for the answer in the concrete historical situation. At the time when the colonial peoples were only waking up, with only infrequent and sporadic risings erupting in the capitalist colonial empire, these could hardly be as important as the national movements of the oppressed peoples of Europe. The latter, particularly in Ireland, visibly revolutionised the situation in the citadel of capitalism. Lenin said: "A blow delivered against the power of the English imperialist bourgeoisie by a rebellion in Ireland is a hundred times more significant politically than a blow of equal force delivered in Asia or Africa."³

But the situation changed as imperialism lost ground in the struggle against the working class and its allies, and as the sporadic actions of oppressed peoples in colonies and dependent countries gradually merged into a powerful national liberation movement and this movement developed closer links with the emancipation struggle of the proletariat in metropolitan countries. This concerned mainly the significance of the national liberation movement.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 410.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 23, p. 59.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 22, p. 357.

Soon after the October Revolution, Lenin pointed out that "in the impending decisive battles in the world revolution, the movement of the majority of the population of the globe, initially directed towards national liberation, will turn against capitalism and imperialism and will, perhaps, play a much more revolutionary part than we expect".¹

For the bourgeoisie, nationalist ideology has always been a stand-by in buttressing its power. It fought against feudalism under the nationalist flag, and later used it to divide the working people of different nationalities. Classes and social groups associated with private property tend to succumb to the nationalist influence of the bourgeoisie, and only proletarians, as Engels wrote, are "by nature free from national prejudice, their spiritual development being in substance humanistic and anti-nationalist".²

Marx and Engels pointed out that the workers make their first and most important step towards resolving the national question, and towards victory in the class struggle, when they frustrate bourgeois attempts to infect working people with the venom of nationalism. It was a formidable task to forge the international unity of proletarians and all working people, solidarity and mutual support, against oppression and exploitation. Marx, Engels and Lenin battled against nationalism and chauvinism every step of the way. They defined the principles of proletarian internationalism, and made it the symbol of the unity of working people of all nationalities.

As first defined by Marx and Engels, proletarian internationalism meant that since workers of different nationalities have the same vital interests and class objectives, fraternal solidarity and mutual support was essential for victory in their struggle. "Proletarians of all countries," Engels wrote, "have the same interest, the same enemy, and will have to fight the same struggle."³

Proletarian internationalism became the ideological basis of the working class parties and programmes on the national question. The recognition that proletarian internationalism is

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 32, p. 482.

² Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 2, S. 614.

³ *Ibid.*

determinative in the ideology and policy of the working class does not mean, however, that its national interests are written off. Marx and Engels pointed to the objective connection between the national and international tasks of the proletariat and showed that they are interwoven. "In the working class movement," Engels wrote, "the *truly* national ideas, i.e., ideas consistent with the economic factors both in agriculture and in industry, factors dominant in a particular country, are at the same time always truly *international* ideas."¹

Lenin made a very important contribution to the Marxist principles of proletarian internationalism. During the imperialist epoch in which he was active, the significance of proletarian internationalism for the liberation movement of workers and working people, for progress in general, had grown tremendously. The foundation for the never formalised and never recorded international alliance of the workers of all countries, proletarian internationalism "in the disintegrating capitalist world, actually means everything",² Lenin said.

The question of socialist revolution was, in effect, becoming a practical issue. Its victory, Lenin said, "calls for the complete confidence, the closest fraternal alliance and the greatest possible unity of revolutionary action on the part of the working class of all the advanced countries".³

Victory of the revolution at first in one or a few advanced countries (which Lenin held to be possible), required the support of the entire international working-class movement.

The significance of proletarian internationalism also increased immeasurably, because the substance of imperialism in the national question, as we have already shown, was the division of the world into oppressor and oppressed nations. This gave rise to two new aspects. First, when the monopoly capital of a country profits far more from plundering colonial and dependent peoples than from exploiting its own workers, there appears what Lenin described as the material or economic basis for infecting the proletariat of the metropolitan country with colonial chauvinism. Second, if the nationalist

¹ Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 33, S. 444.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 449.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 29, p. 103.

influence of the bourgeoisie on a part of the working class is not overcome by proletarian internationalism, it may impede combining proletarian revolution in metropolitan countries with the national liberation movement in the colonies. This is why Leninism concentrates so on popularising proletarian internationalism, and why it substantiates the necessity of spreading the principles of internationalism to the national liberation revolutions in colonies and dependent countries.

There are also other special features of the imperialist epoch that necessitated closer attention to internationalism. The bourgeoisie was promoting chauvinism and nationalism. To buttress its power, it was even prepared to spend part of its superprofits on bribing the upper layers of the working class. It displayed unparalleled zeal, in fact, and would stop at nothing to attack the revolutionary forces and wipe out whatever democracy there was. Marx's warning was therefore especially significant. "Disregard of that bond of brotherhood which ought to exist between the workmen of different countries, and incite them to stand firmly by each other in all their struggle for emancipation," he said, "will be chastised by the common discomfiture of their incoherent efforts."¹

The sharper the class struggle in bourgeois society becomes, the harder the bourgeoisie tries to spread nationalism and chauvinism, deliberately distorting the content of the national question, the more urgent for the proletariat and its parties becomes the study, as Lenin put it, of the entire national question—both in theory and in practice.

As regards *theory*, its content, its place and role in social development, should be correctly defined. So should its main general and specific laws, which was essential in order to work out truly scientific principles for the programme of the proletarian parties. Lenin stressed specially that the Bolshevik programme took account of the two tendencies of capitalism in the national question, proclaiming, firstly, the equality of nations and languages, and opposing privileges of any sort, and, secondly, the principle of internationalism, which requires effective and firm measures against contamination of

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* (in 3 volumes), Vol. 2, p. 17.

the proletariat with bourgeois nationalism, especially its more refined forms.

As regards *practice*, the working-class standpoint on the national question is so translated into policy and organisational and educational work as to secure a united front of workers and working people of different nationalities, leading ultimately to the overthrow of capitalism. The basic difference between the Marxist internationalist programme and the programme of other parties is that the former works not only "for the most complete, consistent and fully applied *equality* of nations and languages, but also for the *amalgamation* of the workers of the different nationalities in *united* proletarian organisations of every kind."¹ The latter reference is to parties, trade unions, and various other mass organisations of the proletariat and all working people.

Internationalist principles are also at work in the structure of the Party. Lenin took pride in the fact that the working-class party in Russia had declared for proletarian internationalism at its birth. This was stressed in its name: it was called the *All-Russia* (rather than *Russian*) Social-Democratic Workers' Party. The Party rejected the federative structure suggested by the Bund, and campaigned for all the then existing isolated social-democratic parties and organisations of the different nationalities to merge in one proletarian party. Leninists prevented the Party from succumbing to petty-bourgeois influences, and succeeded in prevailing on most of the national social-democratic parties of Russia to abandon the federative principle. This was at the 4th Congress of the All-Russia Social-Democratic Workers' Party, and conformed with the clearly expressed desire of workers of all nationalities. True, the Mensheviks adopted a liquidationist posture during the reaction that followed the 1905 revolution in Russia. This was tantamount to outright betrayal and, coupled with outbursts of nationalism within various national social-democratic parties, stymied efforts fully to unite and remodel the parties. But the failure of the conciliators' nationalist plans of imposing federalism on the proletarian party, that is, of shaping it along national principles (registered conclusively at the August 1912

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, pp. 289-90.

conference of the liquidators), was evidence of the correctness of Lenin's principles and of the internationalist integrity of the working class of Russia.

On the eve of the First World War social-chauvinism erupted in the ranks of Europe's Social-Democrats. The principles of proletarian internationalism were consigned to oblivion by most of the social-democratic parties. Corrupted with opportunism, the Western social-democratic parties moved closer and closer to the bourgeoisie of their countries, helping it, in effect, to poison the minds of workers and working people with nationalist ideology. Lenin and his followers did not hesitate to come out against social-chauvinism, campaigning for the Marxist principles of proletarian internationalism in the working-class and social-democratic movement of the world.

There were special reasons why the national question gained prominence at that time in Eastern and part of Central Europe (Russia, Austria, and the Balkans). The main one was that the national movements there had grown stronger, for under the impact of the first Russian revolution oppressed peoples became more active in the fight for national liberation, as well as social emancipation. The blow that this revolution delivered to the vestiges of serfdom speeded up the development of capitalism, stimulating growth of the national consciousness and also national consolidation. Frightened, the tsarist autocracy and the Russian bourgeoisie redoubled national oppression and launched a chauvinistic witchhunt against peoples awakening to the idea of independence. This had the effect of enlivening nationalist trends, which also spread to the national social-democratic parties and organisations.

The nationalist ideas related to the programme of so-called cultural-national autonomy, which mainly demanded that children should be schooled in their national language, were especially harmful. This programme was largely responsible for corrupting the Austrian Social-Democrats, though its negative effects were still greater in the case of the Jewish and a few other national-bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties in peripheral regions of Russia. Lenin described the cultural-national autonomy programme as an expression of the views of the despairing petty bourgeois who has learned from his own experience that the national question cannot be resolved in

capitalist conditions and who out of a feeling of impotence seeks the self-isolation of oppressed peoples—a split all down the united international front of proletarians and all other working people. The slogan of defending “national culture”, though seemingly innocent and even democratic, was in fact a refined variety of nationalism, for it prompted working people to join their bourgeoisie and led objectively to segregation from the proletariat of other nationalities.¹

The jingoism of the monarchists and the revival of both Russian and local bourgeois nationalism, Lenin wrote in June 1913, made it “particularly urgent for Social-Democratic organisations in all parts of Russia to devote greater attention than before to the national question and to work out consistently Marxist decisions on this subject in the spirit of consistent internationalism and unity of proletarians of all nations”.² Primarily, this concerned the internationalist principles of the party structure, and consolidation of the already existing revolutionary action unity of proletarians of different nationalities. Lenin and his followers—J. V. Stalin, S. G. Shahumyan, N. A. Skrypnik, P. I. Stuchka, and others—defended and developed the Marxist teaching on the national question and the basic principles of proletarian internationalism.³ Proletarian internationalism was accentuated in the practical work of local party organisations. Lenin described this as the *proletarian solution of the national question* in the environment of tsarist abuses and bourgeois nationalist propaganda in Russia proper and its periphery. In a letter to Maxim Gorky he observed that for more than a decade the Georgian, Armenian, Tatar and Russian Social-Democrats had worked together in the Caucasus, in *united* party organisations, and that this was also the case in Riga and Vilna (now Vilnius). “This is not a phrase,” he wrote, “but the proletarian solution of the problem of nationalities. The only solution.”⁴

The First World War was a test of loyalty to Marxist-Leninist teaching in proletarian internationalism. It was the opening

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, pp. 503-07, 541.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 19, p. 250.

³ See J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Moscow, 1953, Vol. 2, pp. 300-81; S. Shahumyan, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Vol. 1, 1957, pp. 417-60 (in Russian).

⁴ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 35, p. 85.

stage in the general crisis of capitalism, which engulfed all spheres of bourgeois society, including ideology. The ruling classes were determined to prevent a revolution, and tried to gain influence over the mass social-democratic parties of the Second International. Lamentably, they succeeded. Social-chauvinism took firm root in opportunist soil, paralysed the activity of most of the parties in the Second International, and caused its disintegration. The Bolshevik Party, in which Lenin had cultivated a spirit of fidelity to proletarian internationalism, was the only one that remained faithful to the fraternity of proletarians of all countries. Lenin wrote with pride for the Bolsheviks and workers of Russia that the Bolshevik Party had "performed its duty to the International. The banner of internationalism has not wavered in its hands."¹

On Lenin's initiative, the Bolsheviks set out to unite the internationalist elements of the social-democratic parties. At the very beginning of the imperialist war preparations were begun to form a Third International. The Bolsheviks, the German Spartakovites, the Bulgarian Tesnyaks, and internationalist revolutionaries of other countries worked together under Lenin's leadership for the revival of a united revolutionary front at conferences in Kintal and Zimmerwald. Though constantly harassed by the authorities and maligned by social-chauvinists and centrists (among whom by such prestigious personalities as Karl Kautsky and Georgy Plekhanov), they put out propaganda publications and theoretical works. This was of incalculable significance, because, as Lenin put it, the socialist revolution was likely to "begin in the very near future".²

Lenin's and the Bolshevik Party's stand against social-chauvinism, for the unity of revolutionaries of the belligerent countries, won many followers among the Left Social-Democrats in the parties of the Second International. It helped unite those who after the October Revolution formed the nucleus of new Communist parties, which formed the Third, Communist, International.

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 21, p. 319.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 22, p. 153.

Calling on the workers of all countries to be faithful to internationalism, to work actively for the solution of the national question, Lenin also looked into the theoretical side of the formation of nation-states.

The slogan of national self-determination, once proclaimed by the bourgeoisie, had become specious when coming from the same bourgeoisie in the imperialist epoch. None but the working class, Lenin said, could convert it "from a deception to a truth".¹ Leninism gave the self-determination slogan an internationalist content, and showed that it represented a unity of national and international factors.

The world was divided into a handful of dominant and a mass of oppressed and dependent peoples. In such a world, the proletariat's consistent struggle for the right of nations to self-determination was of special importance. At the end of 1915 Lenin named the subject of his new treatise on the national question as follows: "Imperialism, and the *self-determination of nations*".

The national movements of the time of ascendant capitalism gave rise to a distinct historical period that saw the formation of national states. Lenin wrote: "...For the whole of Western Europe, nay, for the entire civilised world, the national state is *typical* and normal for the capitalist period."² It was normal, because a people's independent statehood accelerates the growth of capitalism and consequently—in the early stage—also the progress of the nation, assuring a freer development of national and international processes despite the fact that the bourgeoisie is in power.

While backing the right of every people to have its own nationally-independent state, Marxists-Leninists oppose demands of "independence at any cost". When the Russian Social-Revolutionary Party, for example, called for "complete and unconditional recognition of the right to national self-determination" and the Polish Social-Democrats responded by welcoming the "unconditional" nature of its demand, Lenin reacted instantly by describing these statements as purely bourgeois-democratic rhetoric which exposed the Social-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 39, p. 737.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 20, p. 397.

Revolutionaries as windbags and revealed the weakness of the Polish Social-Democrats' ties with the class struggle in theoretical outlook and political activity. Referring to the class struggle, he said: "It is to the interests of this struggle that we must *subordinate* the demand for national self-determination. It is this that makes all the difference between our approach to the national question and the bourgeois-democratic approach."¹ And he explained that in some circumstances the *creation* of "independent" states tended to strengthen imperialism.

Let us now see how Lenin elaborated on the ideas of Marx and Engels, and formulated the aims and objectives behind the slogan of the right of nations to self-determination. In Russia's case he described it as the "(now) main objective in the national question" for the Russian and non-Russian proletariat. In the beginning of 1914 he called for daily agitation and propaganda against national-state privileges and for the equal right of all nations to have their national state. In other words, it was a question of *proclaiming* this right, not yet a question of its *effectuation*. An unconditional demand of national independence would be a deliberate act of splitting the united working-class front against tsarism and capitalism, a breakdown into small and therefore weak national states. A big state gave scope for a more rapid development of capitalism and, consequently, brought closer the socialist revolution. The united workers of all nationalities were able to overthrow tsarism and capitalism, and win emancipation, in less time. Lenin stressed, therefore, that "unity of the proletariat's international class struggle, is infinitely more important than the problem of state frontiers".²

The Bolsheviks' slogan of self-determination, Lenin said, was meant to cultivate the socialist way of thinking, the spirit of internationalism and mutual trust among the proletariat and the working people. But this does not mean that it was all talk. The Bolsheviks were prepared to take the lead in building national states for oppressed peoples. But not as an end in itself. For them the main and cardinal aim was to unite proletarians of all nationalities.

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 6, p. 456.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 39, p. 738.

Lenin's thoughts on self-determination and national-state construction naturally concerned all countries, not Russia alone. They were universal, and Lenin was equally concerned with individual countries where matters were coming to a head—with the Irish question, for example, the situation in the Balkans, etc.

The Irish question held a special interest for Lenin. He referred to it time and again, drawing attention to Marx's and Engels' deep involvement, and showing how important their ideas were. "The policy of Marx and Engels on the Irish question," he wrote, "serves as a splendid example of the attitude the proletariat of the oppressor nations should adopt towards national movements, an example which has lost none of its immense *practical* importance."¹

The analysis of the Irish question by Marx and Engels was indeed profound, and the solutions they suggested for it, their forms and methods, were closely aligned with the general objectives of the struggle for the workers' emancipation.

At first, Marx had thought Ireland would regain her liberty as a result of a socialist revolution in England, with the English workers letting the people of Ireland decide on their own future. The profound study he made some time later, however, led him to the conclusion that the emancipation of the English working class was in fact impossible before Ireland's secession. Marx revised his standpoint, Lenin said, not merely out of his sense of justice for Ireland, but in the light of the English workers' class struggle against capitalism: the freedom of the working class and the nation as a whole was stunted and distorted by the fact that England oppressed other peoples.

Aligning the ideas of Marx and Engels with the new stage of capitalism and the new period of international relations, Lenin defined the content of self-determination and the tactics of revolutionaries in oppressor and oppressed countries as follows: "Imperialism consists in a striving of nations that oppress a number of other nations to extend and increase that oppression and to repartition the colonies. This is why the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 442.

question of self-determination of nations today *hinges* on the conduct of socialists of the *oppressor* nations.”¹

The tactics of the working class in oppressor and oppressed countries, as Lenin saw it, amounted to the following: while the proletariat of the oppressor countries advocated freedom of *secession* for the imperialist-oppressed peoples, proletarians of oppressed countries advocated voluntary *union* with the workers of the oppressor country. In the imperialist epoch this was central to the internationalist education of workers in all countries.

Every politically-conscious worker is obliged to advocate and fight for the freedom of secession and the independent development of any people, big or small, whether it is his own country or a neighbouring one that oppresses another or whether a people rises to fight for freedom by itself. In all cases, Lenin pointed out, an internationalist revolutionary should think *not only* of his own nation, but give *precedence* to the interests of all nations, to their common freedom and equality. A member of an oppressor nation should not tolerate the least inequality against an oppressed nation. And a member of an oppressed nation, whether he advocates complete political freedom for his people or alliance with the workers of the oppressor nation, must in either case *combat* petty national narrow-mindedness, exclusiveness, isolation, must consider the whole and the general, and subordinate particular interests to the common.

Lenin associated the essence of proletarian internationalism with the slogan of self-determination. This is of great significance. In his time it made a tremendous impact on the theoretical and political views of Social-Democrats in all countries. Lenin pointed to the mistakes made by certain Social-Democrats (particularly in Poland and Holland), among them Rosa Luxemburg. Locked in struggle with bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalist parties in their countries, challenging their demand of unconditional independence—which tends to split the united international workers’ front—some internationalists (Marxists) came out against the right of nations to self-determination. Though perfectly right in

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 21, p. 293.

opposing the nationalist slogan of secession, they should not (as internationalists) have opposed the self-determination slogan, the main instrument for the internationalist education of workers of both oppressor and oppressed countries. And, certainly, Rosa Luxemburg's followers should not have objected to this slogan being included in the Programme of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party, because in Russia a united revolutionary front of the working people of all nationalities was inconceivable without the use of self-determination as a slogan in the internationalist education of the proletariat.

Lenin exposed the mistaken views of Marxist internationalists in Poland and Holland. They ranked among the finest revolutionaries and internationalists in the world movement, and the substance of their errors was not, in the final analysis, attributable to some objectionable quality, or to betrayal of Marxism. It was rooted in the *peculiar* conditions of their countries, Lenin said.

The situation in Poland and Holland was, indeed, quite unique. Both were small and helpless in face of the great imperialist powers. They lay between large, predatory and rival states. They were small nations with traditions many centuries old, and with great-power aspirations. Furthermore, both retained their former privileges in the imperialist epoch, participating directly or indirectly in the oppression of other peoples (the Polish magnates, for example, helped tsarism oppress the Ukrainian and Byelorussian peoples).

Blind to these peculiar features of their country, the Polish Marxists viewed self-determination in the abstract. Since the interests of the class struggle required workers of all countries to unite, they argued, the slogan of the right of nations to self-determination was irrelevant. But while rejecting self-determination for their own country, they advocated it for the peoples of the colonies.

Describing this attitude as understandable, even legitimate, since it derived from objective factors, Lenin called attention to the fact that what the Polish and Dutch Social-Democrats wished to say was not exactly what they said. There was no reason to censure them for their active opposition to the rabid nationalists of their countries, or for advocating the unity of

the proletarians in all countries. Yet when some of them opposed the slogan of self-determination in the Russian Marxists' programme they were, in effect, sticking to the letter rather than spirit of Marxism. Because by fighting against the nationalism of oppressed nations, Lenin said, "people play into the hands not merely of the bourgeois but of the reactionary nationalism of the *oppressor nation*".¹

Rosa Luxemburg was confused. She did not see the concrete historical situation. She did not see the difference between the Marxist approach to the national question in Western Europe and in Russia.

But despite her mistakes, she was a stalwart fighter against nationalism and for proletarian internationalism. Lenin used her erroneous views on the national question as an example in censuring similar views among Social-Democrats in other countries. His criticism helped to stimulate the internationalism of the Left wing of the movement, and prevailed on internationalist revolutionaries to reject the social-chauvinism of the Second International.

Subsequently, Lenin often described Rosa Luxemburg as an internationalist and included her among the founders and leaders of the Communist International. She had correctly assessed the internationalist character of the October Revolution by calling it a great revolution. One of her articles about that revolution, its powerful impact on the awakening of workers in the West, Lenin described as strongly internationalist in substance.²

Incorrect interpretations of some of the aspects of the national question, particularly incomprehension of the internationalist content of self-determination, Lenin noted, only went to show that the problem of national relations in the imperialist epoch was extremely complicated and confused. The working class, he said, should always be aware—especially in the setting of imperialist-bred wars and due to the speciousness of the bourgeois "defence of the fatherland" slogan—of the three main types of relations: a) of the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 544.

² See *ibid.*, Vol. 27, p. 546.

oppressed to the oppressor nation; b) between two oppressor nations; and c) relations within a system of equal nations.

Lenin noted that "we lived not only in separate states, but also in a definite *system* of states, and singled out the third type of national relations as the most complex. It provided the proletariat of all nations with the most favourable conditions for international unity and joint struggle. The imperialist war split the united front of proletarians of all nations at a time when the socialist revolution was already *maturing* in both coalitions. "Only for these reasons are we against 'defence of the fatherland', *only* for these reasons!"¹ Lenin said.

There were many incorrect conceptions of the right of nations to self-determination. Its critics overlooked an important point. The working class, Lenin pointed out, should, of course, always advocate *the right* of nations to self-determination, but in doing so weigh the pros and cons, the *desirability* of secession. In the autumn of 1913, a Central Committee conference with local Bolshevik functionaries in Poronino recorded in its decision at Lenin's suggestion that the question of secession should be settled "exclusively on its merits in each particular case in conformity with the interests of social development as a whole and with the interests of the proletarian class struggle for socialism."²

This took the Marxist theory of proletarian internationalism a step farther in the most complicated environment of the imperialist epoch. And Lenin deserves all the credit for it.

Not only had proletarian internationalism become the beacon of the international working-class movement. More, before ever a socialist revolution had triumphed, Lenin laid the ideological foundations and paved the way organisationally for a worldwide Communist movement.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 35, p. 274.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 19, p. 429.

CHAPTER THREE

THE NATIONAL QUESTION AND THE STRUGGLE FOR ITS SOLUTION IN THE CAPITALIST WORLD IN THE FIRST AND SECOND STAGES OF THE GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

1. LENIN WORKS ON THE THEORY OF THE NATIONAL AND COLONIAL QUESTIONS IN THE PERIOD AFTER THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

The outbreak of the general crisis of capitalism, the Great October Socialist Revolution, and the great uplift of the revolutionary movement all over the world, provided Lenin with rich background material for a further study of the Marxist theory of the national and colonial questions.

The impulse for this study came from a number of sources. There had been substantive and partly unforeseen changes in the development of the world revolutionary process. "Things have turned out differently from what Marx and Engels expected,"¹ Lenin said, commenting on the fact that the proletarian revolution had triumphed at first not in any of the advanced capitalist countries, but in relatively backward Russia. Since Russia was a multinational country encompassing huge masses of oppressed peoples in the East, the national-colonial question acquired top priority in the development of the world revolution. Many new factors appeared also in the intrinsic processes of the life of the peoples, and in their mutual relationships. Two points were decisive for defining the substance and forms of national and international processes: the emancipation of previously rightless peoples in the former Russian empire, on the one hand, and the mounting national liberation movement of imperialist-oppressed peoples, on the other. This required a theoretical conceptualisation of the new elements in the content of the national question, and also in the correlation of various factors—the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 472.

class and the national, the international and the national, the objective and the subjective—in the life and liberation struggle of the peoples.

The Bolsheviks, Lenin stressed, always took their stand “first and foremost on an exact economic analysis”.¹ To study the essence of the national question, like that of any other complex aspect in the life of society, the class factors stemming from the economic conditions in capitalist countries had to be examined most closely. This provided scientific grounds for determining the “strength of the national cohesion” of the classes and social strata of the nation, to gauge the correlation of the class and the national elements, and to define the motive forces behind the liberation struggle.

Lenin classed the leading imperialist powers, which exploited more than half the world's population, as countries marked by this economic factor: their bourgeoisie bribed the upper section of the working class out of the superprofits it obtained in the colonies. Coupled with chauvinistic corruption of part of the working class, this bribery was one of the main factors impeding class differentiation in the capitalist nations. This was an obstacle for the proletariat in the struggle against the bourgeoisie, and Lenin drew the conclusion (soon after the October Revolution) that “it is easier for the movement to start in the countries that are not among those exploiting countries which have opportunities for easy plunder and are able to bribe the upper section of their workers”.²

In Russia, where the working-class aristocracy was not numerous at all, the interests of the bulk of the proletariat were not only directly opposite to those of the bourgeoisie but—most importantly—coincided with the interests of the entire peasantry, which was fighting against the remnants of serfdom. As a matter of fact, this was the “basic economic point” in the relationship of classes, due to which, Lenin pointed out, “under these exceptional conditions we were able for several months to rely on the support of all the peasants”.³ The differentiation in the nation had, consequent-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 192.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 26, pp. 471-72.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 29, p. 190.

ly, reached a point where, as he put it, all the vital forces of the nation gathered on one side of the barricades, while the bourgeoisie, a redundant class in the national structure, was on the other side.

There was also a group of countries and regions (with the bulk of the world population) in which that differentiation was still inexistent or only beginning, because in many parts of the world capitalism had only just begun to develop (this applied to nearly all of Asia and Africa, some of the Latin American countries, and even part of Russia). Here, the as yet only incipient class differentiation, on the one hand, and the economic and political subordination to imperialist powers, on the other, pushed the struggle for social emancipation into the background, giving precedence to general national objectives: liberation from foreign oppression, political self-determination and the forming of national states, and freedom for the processes of national consolidation.

Lenin's analysis of the class aspects implicit economically in the content of the national question in the different conditions of the capitalist world and its colonial periphery, led to the theoretical conclusion that all nations belonged to one of two basic groups: some developed from medievalism to bourgeois democracy, and others from bourgeois democracy to proletarian democracy. This point had exceedingly important practical implications — first of all for the strategy and tactics of the class struggle of the workers, and for the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples. This is why, following the October Revolution Lenin occupied himself with the content and the ways of solving the national question in the bourgeois world, and linked his study with the theoretical elaboration of the entire concept of the world revolution.

Lenin's works after the October Revolution contain invaluable data on the place of the national question in, first, the world revolutionary process, second, the developed capitalist countries and, third, the life of the colonial peoples. In studying these aspects, he never forgot that "a new era in world history has begun".¹ This meant first of all that the establishment of proletarian dictatorship in one country,

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 307.

accompanied by an unprecedented uplift of the international working-class movement, enhanced the influence of the working class on all the other population groups, and placed it in the centre of the new historical epoch. Also highly important was the fact that capitalism's undivided rule in the world was over. The world's first socialist worker-peasant state had emerged and was making progress. Furthermore, as Lenin said, after the October Revolution "reciprocal relations between peoples and the world political system as a whole are determined by the struggle waged by a small group of imperialist nations against the Soviet movement and the Soviet states headed by Soviet Russia. Unless we bear that in mind, we shall not be able to pose a single national or colonial problem correctly, even if it concerns a most outlying part of the world".¹

The extraordinary uplift of the struggle of the oppressed peoples as a result of the general crisis of capitalism, and still more under the impact of the October Revolution, transformed the national liberation movement into an active force of the world revolutionary process. This transformation had begun in the early 20th century, but was not completed until the victory of the October Revolution. The First World War and the establishment of Soviet power in Russia, Lenin pointed out, had *once and for all* transformed the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples into an active factor of world politics and the revolutionary demolition of imperialism.²

Now that history, as Lenin put it, began marching ahead still more quickly, there occurred an "interweaving of imperialist and national liberation trends, movements and aspirations",³ on the one hand, and a most intimate interconnection of the national liberation movement with the development of the world's first socialist country and the entire international working-class movement, on the other. Now, in order to conceptualise the world revolutionary process, it was important to establish on a strictly scientific basis the correlation of these

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 241.

² See *ibid.*, Vol. 32, pp. 454-55; Vol. 33, p. 499.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 27, p. 52.

factors. At the beginning of 1918, Lenin stressed that the national liberation movements were incalculably weaker than imperialism, and that they could not win until the socialist revolution matured "in the depths of all the advanced countries".¹

This point is important, because soon after the October Revolution there appeared divergent views among revolutionaries in different countries. Some argued that national movements were reactionary in the epoch of proletarian revolutions, while others said that the national liberation of oppressed peoples would tear down the imperialist colonial system on its own and, more, tilt the scales against the capitalist system in the metropolitan countries, where, they alleged, the working class was not strong enough to cope with its own bourgeoisie. This had nothing to do with the Marxist-Leninist theory of the national-colonial question.

Time and again Lenin stressed the outstanding significance of the national liberation movement for the world revolutionary process. He pointed to its bearing on the outcome of the struggle between world socialism and world capitalism, and on the final victory of socialism.² This view did not conflict with the determining role played in the world revolution by the international working class. When M. N. Roy³ took an ultra-leftist stand before and during the Second Congress of the Communist International, ascribing a socialist character to the national liberation movement and claiming that the future of the revolutionary movement in Europe depends completely on the course of the revolution in the East, and even that the future of world communism depends on the triumph of communism in the East, Lenin decried these views. First of all, he called for "a determined struggle against attempts to give a communist colouring to bourgeois-democratic liberation trends in the backward countries"⁴ and, secondly, showed that

¹ *Ibid*

² See *ibid.*, Vol. 33, p. 500.

³ Roy, Manabendra Nath (1892-1948)—Indian political figure who took an active part in the work of the Comintern during the twenties and was a member of the Comintern Executive. Subsequently left the Communist movement.

⁴ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 149

there was absolutely no reason to think that the future of the West depended exclusively on the degree of development and the strength of the revolutionary movement in Eastern countries. The world revolutionary process, as Lenin conceived it, was one whole, the components of which, given the leading role of the international working class, acted in close collaboration, thus culminating in the downfall of world capitalism and the final victory of socialism. The world revolution, he wrote, will not be only and chiefly a battle of revolutionary proletarians in each country against its bourgeoisie, but also a struggle of all the imperialist-oppressed colonies and countries, all dependent countries, against international imperialism.¹ Lenin saw the substance of the world revolutionary process following the October Revolution in that the class struggle against exploiters in all the advanced countries had begun to merge with the national war of the oppressed peoples against the colonialists.²

If the colonial peoples were to be attributed the decisive place, the working class in the metropolitan countries would have to wait until they win; also, the masses in the colonial and dependent countries would not be required to seek alliance with the international working-class movement or the Soviet country. This would impair the alliance of the main streams of the world revolutionary process, crucial for the world revolution. Hence, correct assessment of the place and role of the national liberation movement was not a merely academic question.

Lenin's assessment of the essence of the world revolutionary process and the relative importance of its streams was, and still is, of the utmost importance. Gradually, revolutionaries in all countries shifted to his point of view. True, the First Comintern Congress had put down in its resolution that oppressed peoples will not get independence until after the workers in the imperialist countries come to power. But this standpoint later changed under the impact of Lenin's inference that the order in which peoples of different countries attained freedom, could vary. The interdependence of libera-

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 158.

² See *ibid.*

tion in the metropolitan countries and the colonies gained widespread recognition. The revolutionary movement in the colonies, the Third Comintern Congress recorded in the summer of 1921, was "as integral a part of the world revolution as the uprising of the proletariat in the capitalist countries of the Old and New World".¹ It should be borne in mind, however, that the national liberation movement is a component of the world proletarian revolution only in objective significance, because subjectively, in composition and aim, it remains bourgeois-democratic,² and, therefore, its main objective is national rather than social liberation.

In post-October period Lenin also devoted himself to another important theoretical problem—the class differentiation inside nations. The First World War, he said, had "accelerated social development to an unheard-of degree",³ and with it the differentiation of class forces within nations. The October Revolution gave this process added impulse. But it did not develop uniformly in different countries. In his notes at the conference of delegates to the Second All-Russia Congress of the Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East, Lenin wrote: "*Concrete questions of each nation, according to the extent of its development, its special features, etc.*"⁴ This note reveals the depth of Lenin's approach to social phenomena and the importance he attached to the theory of nations and national relations in dealing with concrete practical questions of the revolutionary movement and the reconstruction of society along socialist lines.

In Russia alone had the class antagonism reached a point where the national community of the working people and their exploiters was totally eroded by the class struggle and the revolutionary movement. The whole country and all its nations, Lenin said, were "divided into two great camps",⁵ and there was a split in the mass of the people.

¹ *The Communist International. 1919-1943. Documents*, Vol. I, London-New York-Toronto, 1956, p. 234.

² See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 241.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 26, p. 386.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. 42, p. 150.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. 26, p. 369.

If revolutionaries were to ignore the processes of class differentiation or to seek only the "self-determination of working people" inside the nation, Lenin said, they would thereby overlook the national question. "This might be done if there were people with no specific national features," he explained. "But there are no such people and we cannot build socialist society in any other way."¹ The theory of revolution, he said, must reckon with all the stages through which a nation develops, with all processes "in the depth of nations". For the socialist revolution to be victorious, "we have to wait until the given nation develops, until the differentiation of the proletariat from the bourgeois elements, which is inevitable, has taken place".²

Examining processes in the bourgeois world following the October Revolution, Lenin called attention to the fact that the self-determination of the working masses inside capitalist nations followed a complex, difficult and devious pattern. Depending on various factors, it was slower in some countries and more rapid in others. Of Finland, for example, Lenin said that at one time the process of differentiation there was "remarkably clear, forceful and deep", while in Germany in some respects it developed in even more rapid way than in Russia, while in others, "in a slower and more sanguinary way".³

Knowledge of the differentiation processes is useful not only for the class struggle of the workers in the country, but also for a correct assessment of the international processes and relations between nations. In this context, correct attitude towards the right of nations to self-determination is of special significance. "We must be particularly cautious with regard to the various nations," Lenin pointed out, "for there is nothing worse than lack of confidence on the part of a nation."⁴ And as long as the differentiation has not come about, it is disastrous for revolutionaries to set the objective of self-determination of the working people inside nations. "If we were to declare that

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 196.

² *Ibid.*, p. 172.

³ See *ibid.*, p. 173.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 174.

we do not recognise any Finnish nation, but only the working people, that would be sheer nonsense," Lenin stressed. "We cannot refuse to recognise what actually exists; it will itself compel us to recognise it."¹

Every nation, Lenin said, must have the right of self-determination; this will also facilitate the self-determination of the working people. Haste, however, would only result in negative developments, and, among other things, in fanning bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism. Lenin and the Council of People's Commissars of the RSFSR (of which he was head) displayed the utmost tact and caution in establishing friendly relations with neighbouring peoples. We owe it to our recognition of the right of nations to self-determination, Lenin pointed out, that the process of class differentiation within the Finnish nation ran its course more easily. But he also showed that the reactionary bourgeoisie in Germany, Poland and Finland were eager to hold up the differentiation and popularised nationalist ideology, trying to create the appearance that all-national tasks did exist and that national unity superceded class unity.

Calling for caution again and again in matters related to national feelings, Lenin demanded that the difference between oppressor and oppressed nations should always receive due attention. He stressed that relations between the peoples of the Soviet country exercised a strong influence on national relations in the bourgeois world. In this sense he described the relationship between the Russian nation and the peoples of Turkestan as of gigantic, truly historic significance. "For the whole of Asia and for all the colonies of the world, for thousands and millions of people," he said, "the attitude of the Soviet Workers' and Peasants' Republic to the weak and hitherto oppressed nations is of very practical significance."²

The question of the relationship between oppressor and oppressed nations in the bourgeois world is also reflected in the principles followed by the Communist parties in their national policy. In his theses on the national and colonial question for the Second Comintern Congress, Lenin urged every party to "base its policy... not on abstract and formal

¹ *Ibid.*

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 30, p. 138.

principles but, first, on a precise appraisal of the specific historical situation and, primarily, of economic conditions; second, on a clear distinction between the interests of the oppressed classes, of working and exploited people, and the general concept of national interests as a whole, which implies the interests of the ruling class; third, on an equally clear distinction between the oppressed, dependent and subject nations and the oppressing, exploiting and sovereign nations.”¹

Lenin's report to the Second Comintern Congress was a model of how a historically-concrete situation is analysed to determine the content of the national question in the imperialist epoch. He stressed that the most important idea of his theses on the national and colonial question was the distinction between oppressed and oppressor peoples. And going back again to the subject at the end of 1922 in *The Question of Nationalities or "Autonomisation"*, he stressed the importance of a truly internationalist working-class approach in establishing fraternal relations between previously oppressed and oppressor peoples. Not only should formal equality be observed, he stressed, but the former oppressor nation should assume inequalities that would compensate for the actually existing inequality.²

Lenin devoted so much attention to relations between oppressor and oppressed nations after the October Revolution because, among other things, the new epoch came into the world under the sign of proletarian internationalism. Internationalism was no longer simply the ideology and outlook of the proletariat, but an important social factor in the world revolutionary process. The international working-class movement and the world's first Soviet worker-peasant state were its natural sphere of influence, but it now spread to the national liberation movement. This was an entirely new factor. The First Comintern Congress formulated the slogan, "Long Live the Revolutionary Alliance of the Oppressed Eastern Peoples with the Socialist Workers of Russia and Europe!" And since the concept of proletarian internationalism had filled out in

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 145.

² See *ibid.*, Vol. 36, p. 608.

content, Lenin later amplified the Communists' battlecall, "Workers of All Countries, Unite!", with a call to the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries, "Workers and Oppressed Peoples of All Countries, Unite!"

Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, which imbued its entire content, became the mortar that bound the international working-class movement and the first socialist state with the national liberation movement. This was important because, though the latter was already one of the streams of the world revolutionary movement, it was not socialist in character. Lenin's exhaustive analysis of the economic laws operating in the colonial world and of the structure of colonial society led him to the conclusion that the national liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples would not be a struggle against capitalism in general, but against foreign oppression and the remnants of medievalism. This was the basis for the Leninist theoretical and practical proposition that the aim of forming a united anti-imperialist front was entirely feasible in colonies and dependent countries. And the national bourgeoisie, too, could enter that front together with the workers, the peasants, and the national intelligentsia. With the differentiation of classes still indistinct, the labouring masses and the bourgeoisie have unquestionably common national objectives, as long as the processes of national consolidation are not yet consummated and foreign oppression blocks the right to self-determination and independent national statehood, and as long as capitalism is not yet fully developed and many elements of medievalism survive in the economy and the way of life. All this was a sound basis for a united anti-imperialist front.

Lenin's brilliant deduction, which is still of the utmost relevance for the national liberation struggle of the imperialist-oppressed peoples, did not gain instant acceptance among many of the revolutionaries in the advanced capitalist, let alone oppressed, countries. This was due to their inattention to the social processes. Furthermore they overlooked the interaction in the liberation struggle of objective and subjective factors and the class and national factors.

Those who had at first disagreed with Lenin's ideas of an anti-imperialist front in colonies and dependent countries,

found unacceptable the proposition that the interests of the burgeoning proletariat and the working masses in general could blend with the interests of the bourgeoisie, which participated in the national liberation movement under the nationalist banner. Yet Lenin did take these two factors fully into account. Though he argued in favour of a temporary alliance with bourgeois democracy in colonies and backward countries, he stressed that the proletariat "should not merge with it, and should under all circumstances uphold the independence of the proletarian movement even if it is in its most embryonic form".¹ As for the place and role of nationalism in the national liberation struggle of oppressed peoples, he explained to the delegates of the Second Congress of the Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East: "You will have to base yourselves on the bourgeois nationalism which is awakening, and must awaken, among those peoples, and which has its historical justification."² But he warned that it was essential to be constantly aware of the line beyond which support of nationalist demands could become an apology for bourgeois power instead of facilitating the liberation of the oppressed people.

Lenin's contribution to the theory of the national and colonial questions helped the Communist and Workers' parties in capitalist, as well as colonial, countries to keep the national question in the right perspective in their strategy and tactics, and to direct the revolutionary movement of the masses for social and national liberation.

2. VICTORY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION. CHANGES IN THE CONTENT OF THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN THE CAPITALIST WORLD

Lenin's theory of the national and colonial question based on an analysis of the social consequences of the First World War is fundamental for our examination of the development of nations and national relations in the bourgeois world throughout the first stage of the general crisis of capitalism. The

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 150.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 30, p. 162.

division of peoples into a small number of privileged oppressor nations and a vast majority of oppressed dependent and semi-dependent nations, had become still more pronounced. "The arch-criminal and arch-reactionary war of 1914-1918," Lenin said at the end of 1919, "still further accentuated this division and as a result aggravated rancour and hatred."¹

During the preparations for the Second Comintern Congress Lenin made an especially close study of the new elements in the relations of oppressed and oppressor nations, especially those that resulted from the Great October Socialist Revolution. But he also looked into the relations among peoples of the developed capitalist states. Having already drawn up and circulated an outline of his report on the national and colonial question, he continued his probe into the facts and data at his disposal. He asked all "comrades, especially those who possess concrete information on any of these very complex problems, to let [him] have their opinions, amendments, addenda and concrete remarks." He recounted the regions, countries and peoples of special interest to him.²

In his analysis of the content of the national question in the new situation, Lenin devoted more attention than before to the economic reasons for the division of the capitalist world into oppressor and oppressed nations. Faithful to the Marxist rule of first analysing the economic, and only then the national, relations, he stressed that "in this age of imperialism, it is particularly important ... to establish the concrete economic facts and to proceed from concrete realities, not from abstract postulates, in all colonial and national problems".³

Lenin took special note of the territorial changes and the redistribution of the world population.

The territory, economy and population of the Soviet country had dropped out of the capitalist system. This was the main change in the postwar world. Sixteen per cent of the area and nearly eight per cent of the population of the globe had given a start to world socialism, to a merciless life-and-death

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 30, p. 293.

² See *ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 144.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 240.

struggle between two classes, two worlds, two world-historical epochs.¹

The fact that capitalism's undivided rule had ended, was of cardinal significance. The life of mankind no longer depended exclusively on the development trends of world capitalism, but also to an ever growing degree on the increasingly strong positions of socialism, the new social system. The class struggle between the old and new spread to international, i.e., nation-to-nation and state-to-state relations—an area where imperialism had previously held undivided sway.

At first glance, the post-World War I territorial and population changes in the capitalist world did not mean much, because the redistribution had occurred mainly between the oppressor nations, rather than between oppressor and oppressed. Britain had seized German colonies with an area of over 2,000,000 sq. km. and Turkey's colonial possessions of 875,000 sq. km., while France "acquired" colonies of the same two defeated countries totalling 745,000 and 205,000 sq. km. respectively. "Furious wrangling over the partitioning of Turkey, Persia, Mesopotamia and China," Lenin said in his report to the Second Comintern Congress, "is going on between Japan, Britain, America, France."² The oppression of the peoples in those colonies did not end. On the contrary. Data quoted by Lenin showed that profits on investments in the enslaved countries increased 3- to 4-fold during the war.

Naturally, this affected national relations and accentuated the split between the peoples. But there were two other important factors behind the aggravation of national relations. First, the changed situation in the leading group of imperialist countries. Intimations of change appeared during the war, when the United States grew from a debtor into the main creditor, obtaining a financial hold on Britain, France and Italy. The inter-allied debt increased seven-fold; that of Britain and France amounted to 52-54 per cent of their national wealth, while Italy's was as high as 65-70 per cent. This and the dissatisfaction of the imperialist powers over the results of the

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 355.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 226.

redistribution of colonies and spheres of influence, led Lenin to the deduction that there was "disintegration among the victors".

The predatory war in general, and the huge debts in particular, caused mass ruin of unprecedented proportions. And the bourgeoisie, straining to justify its anti-people policy, tried to blame other peoples, to breed nationalism and chauvinism.

The second factor was the victors' plunder of the defeated countries, formalised in the peace treaties. Germany, for example, lost all her colonies, including her colonial property, and her merchant fleet. On top of this, she was committed to pay 226,000 million marks in gold over 42 years—before May 1, 1963—and annually throughout that period disburse 12 per cent of the value of her exports, to supply the victors 43 million tons of coal yearly, to pay the cost of their occupation army (for 15 years), etc. Germany's allies were put in an equally untenable position. "The Treaty of Versailles," Lenin commented on this score, "has placed Germany and the other defeated countries in a position that makes their economic existence physically impossible, deprives them of all rights, and humiliates them."¹

The changes in the economic relations of peoples caused by the general crisis of capitalism, were also changes in the objective conditions of the national question and its content. The main tendency was towards political reaction all along the line. In the context of the national question, this was seen, among other things, in a proliferation of *transitional* forms of dependence, including such where political independence was outwardly retained. However, this was not simply a greater degree of political oppression exerted for the sake of new incomes, although that, too, undoubtedly existed. In a situation where the proletarian revolution was objectively imminent in many countries and had become an immediate danger to bourgeois rule, special significance is acquired by Lenin's observation that national and social oppression of enslaved peoples was "a source for artificially retarding the collapse of capitalism, and artificially supporting opportunism

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 217.

and social-chauvinism in the imperialist nations which dominate the world.”¹

Changes in the objective content of the national question gave rise to qualitatively new subjective developments—in the policy of states, classes and parties, and in the thinking of individuals.

To begin with, they reflected in many different ways on the substance and forms of the national and international processes. The national consciousness of peoples, their urge to form or consolidate their national statehood, grew more rapidly. This was one of the main trends, and the other was an increasing closeness between the working people of different nationalities in the fight for social emancipation, on the one hand, and between the dominant classes of different nations, who joined hands to combat the revolutionary movement, on the other.

This growth of national consciousness and national feelings among working people was an incontestably positive factor. Lenin did not hesitate, for example, to help the Polish Communists to correct their errors in the national question. He welcomed the stress on tact laid by the Communists of Czechoslovakia in dealing with the national feelings of the workers, and so on. His influence, too, helped eliminate the notion current in some West European countries that the development of the revolution on a world scale would automatically abolish the nation-state frameworks.

The revolutionaries in the West took note of the natural growth of the national consciousness of the peoples, and were consequently able to play a prominent part in the formation of a number of new national states. True, despite their efforts, these states became bourgeois states. This applies first and foremost to the states that arose on the ruins of Austria-Hungary: Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. Several bourgeois states were formed in the territory of the former Russian empire: Poland, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

Some states came into being contrary to the interests, and in a few cases even despite direct counteraction, of certain

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*. Vol. 22, p. 342.

Entente elements. The bourgeoisie of some of these new countries did not hesitate to oppose even the big imperialist powers as soon as the possibility of a proletarian revolution had paled, because it reckoned correctly that good relations with the Soviet Republic were more beneficial than subordination to the Entente, which strangled and plundered them. "This is the tremendous victory we have gained over the Finnish bourgeoisie in the national question,"¹ Lenin said when it became obvious that bourgeois Finland had changed its course, seeking peace with Soviet Russia.

The international unity of the working people was obviously firmer. To shore up its own position, the bourgeoisie sought to weaken this unity, to fan nationalism and chauvinism. National unity was portrayed as the decisive factor in the life of the peoples, while the class unity of working people of different nationalities was stigmatised as a "fiction" of revolutionary agitators. Nationalist propaganda diverted the people's attention, centering it against other peoples. This, Lenin pointed out, was the only recourse left to the bourgeoisie for "defeating their own workers in every country".²

The capitalist class was at pains to fan nationalism and chauvinism towards Soviet Russia, the main seat of the revolution. This was done in Poland, Finland, and the Baltic countries. The Russian workers and peasants, the Bolshevik Party, were accused of every possible evil. Human emotions, notably patriotic feelings, were being concentrated in a national hatred of everything Russian. Referring to the complex and conflicting development of the Polish proletarian movement in the spring of 1919, Lenin pointed out that "there the workers are being intimidated by statements to the effect that the Muscovites, the Great-Russians, who have always oppressed the Poles, want to carry their Great-Russian chauvinism into Poland in the guise of communism".³ Of the Finnish bourgeoisie Lenin said that they "were deceiving the people, were deceiving the working people by alleging that the

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 29, p. 194.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 28, p. 150.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 29, p. 175.

Muscovites, the chauvinists, the Great-Russians, wanted to crush the Finns".¹

Lenin made the most of every opportunity to probe the development of nations and the essence of national relations in every country, and studied the effect they had on the workers' class struggle and the revolutionary movement in general.

His works contain a conclusive analysis of the place and role of the national question in the high and low tides of revolution in Europe under the impact of the October Revolution. Not national but class contradictions, he found, motivated the behaviour of the bourgeoisie, irrespective of the country, when it resorted to nationalism in trying to buttress its rule. The example of Germany in 1918 and 1919 and Soviet Hungary in the spring and summer of 1919 showed this most distinctly. Nationalism was the banner that rallied all the counter-revolutionary forces. It was also the main instrument of the Polish bourgeoisie when it desperately tried to stem the mounting wave of revolution in 1920. Since war was the most suitable ambience for chauvinism, the bourgeoisie in many European countries deliberately frustrated the peace efforts of the Soviet Republic. Soviet peace proposals to Poland in January 1920, Lenin stressed, "evoked merely an outburst of savage chauvinism in Poland, France and other countries, and prompted Poland to attack us".²

Consequently, in some cases the national processes produced a higher degree of national consciousness and resulted in the formation of national states, which was, of course, positive factor. In other cases, however, the bourgeoisie managed to profit from this greater national consciousness and people's patriotism, and to pervert this development, sowing nationalism and chauvinism. This latter fact may be regarded as one of the main reasons why the revolutionary working class failed to overcome the force of the national cohesion of the exploiters and exploited. The prevailing class differentiation proved insufficient to rally the majority of people in the capitalist nations round the working class, and to put the nation on the socialist path.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 171.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 275.

Yet the international processes, which had encompassed millions upon millions of people acquired a truly unprecedented character in the capitalist world, too, were leading up to the victory of the socialist revolution. The motives behind them varied. Firstly, there were the internal factors, such as the sharper class contradictions and the ensuing revolutionary situations in the developed capitalist states, and the wish of working people of all nationalities, headed by the proletariat, to unite in an international front against capitalism. Secondly, there was the powerful international impact of the October Revolution and the early socialist reforms in the Soviet land.

Anteceding the international processes (and later becoming one of the main factors behind them) was the appearance of militant groups of internationalist revolutionaries in the early months of the imperialist First World War, who laid the foundation for future communist parties in many of the developed capitalist countries. Their activity was closely associated with Lenin, who then resided in Western Europe and was the organiser of the Zimmerwald Left.

Lenin stressed, referring to the internationalist revolutionaries, "it is on such people *alone* that the future of socialism depends".¹ That is why, only weeks after the outbreak of the war, when the Second International broke down under the impact of opportunism, Lenin headed all those who set out to lay the groundwork for the Third, Communist International. The basis for it was the international working class movement and the internationalist character of the socialist revolution germinating in many countries. The principles of the new Communist International, the acceptance of which, on Lenin's proposal, was made obligatory for every party joining its ranks, included proletarian internationalism. Among the internationalist duties of Communists defined by Lenin special significance attached to the requirement of "selflessly to help any Soviet republic in its struggle against counter-revolutionary forces",² and the pledge to "support—in deed, not merely in word—every colonial liberation

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 24, p. 80.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 210.

movement, demand the expulsion of its compatriot imperialists from the colonies".¹

Proletarian internationalism struck deep root among the vanguard of working people all over the world. Thirty-five communist and left-socialist organisations from 21 European, American and Asian countries came to the First Congress of the Communist International in March 1919. Later, the growth of the international processes was still more precipitous: communist parties from as many as 48 countries, 28 youth leagues and a number of other proletarian organisations—representing 52 countries in all—participated in the Third Congress of the Comintern, in June 1921. By that time the world communist movement had 2,230,000 members, including more than 1,500,000 in capitalist countries.

It was the general crisis of capitalism and the October Revolution that contributed to the unprecedented scale of the worldwide liberation movement of working people developing under the banner of proletarian internationalism. In Germany, for example, more than one million participated in the January 1918 strike organised by the Spartacus League in the war industries. Nearly 1.5 million people participated in strikes in Britain in 1918. In France, there were 213 strikes in the first four months of 1919, and as many as 1,050 in May and June, the number of strikers growing eight-fold. And in the United States, 1,227,000 took part in strikes in 1917 and 4,160,000 in 1919.

In many countries the strike movement built up into revolutions: in Finland, in January 1918; in Germany and Austria-Hungary, in the autumn of 1918 (tearing down the monarchies). In the spring of 1919, Soviet republics were proclaimed in quick succession in Hungary, Bavaria and Slovakia.

The capitalist world was gripped by crisis. National partitions fell. Chauvinism receded despite the many pre-war years of bourgeois propaganda. Workers of all nationalities gave each other their hands and rose as one man to fight their exploiters.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 209.

The profound international influence of the October Revolution in Russia and the beginning of socialist reconstruction, Lenin said, "has started a conflagration all over Europe and America".¹

Understandably, the impact of the October Revolution was most distinctly visible in the social domain, sharpening the class contradictions. But it also had a strong influence on the national and international processes.

The internationalist influence of the October Revolution on Germany, for example, was all-engulfing. Convinced at the time that the German revolution was maturing, Lenin said that the Soviet working class should "serve it as far as possible by *work*, agitation and fraternisation.... That is what revolutionary proletarian internationalism means".²

In *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, Lenin examined the internationalist influence of the October Revolution and of the policy of the Bolshevik Party on the capitalist world. In addition to the special chapter, "What Is Proletarian Internationalism?", he looked into the new elements of internationalism literally on every page of the book, showing how opportunists of Kautsky's type betrayed socialism and internationalism, and displayed their petty-bourgeois nationalist limitations. Lenin used the factual background of the revolutionary reconstruction in Russia to demonstrate the Marxist postulate that the basic interests of the workers of any country coincide with those of the international working-class movement. This is precisely why he said the tactics of the Bolshevik Party following the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship in Russia "were the only internationalist tactics, because they did the utmost possible in one country *for* the development, support and awakening of the revolution *in all countries*".³ This was tremendously successful, Lenin said, because Bolshevism became *worldwide*, providing the international working-class movement with an ideology, theory, programme and tactics — and this not only through the merits of the Russian Bolsheviks, but also by virtue of the most

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 26, p. 513.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 27, p. 23.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 28, p. 292.

profound and universal acknowledgement by the masses of these truly revolutionary tactics.

Lenin laid strong emphasis on internationalism in the tactics of the Bolsheviks in the autumn of 1918, for at that time a victorious socialist revolution in Germany was looming. Lenin even advised to refrain for a while from restoring Soviet power in the German-occupied parts of the Ukraine, Byelorussia and the Baltic countries, which may have had an adverse effect on the ripening socialist revolution in Germany. Referring to the situation in the autumn of 1918, Lenin said that the main link in the chain of the world revolutionary process was the German link, "since the German revolution is already ripe; and the success of the world revolution most of all depends on it."¹

Lenin commended those Communists in the occupied areas who refrained from attacking the occupation troops to avoid giving German reaction a pretext for uniting all counter-revolutionary forces and petty-bourgeois elements on a chauvinist basis, and who said: "...We are internationalists, we must look at things from the point of view both of Russia and of Germany."² And when the German revolution did break out—though worker-peasant power was not yet proclaimed—Lenin lost no time, as we can see from the projected measures of support, to define Soviet Russia's relationship with the future socialist state. The purport of these measures was an enduring alliance with revolutionary Germany and aid in consolidating its victory. Among other things, Lenin issued an order to deliver 15 trainloads of grain to the German border for the future German worker-peasant government. And this despite the fact that Soviet Russia was herself racked by hunger. "...We are *beginning to prepare* a fraternal alliance, *grain*, military assistance. We shall all die to help the German workers in advancing the revolution that has broken out in Germany,"³ Lenin said, showing an unparalleled example of genuine internationalism on the part of a working class

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Work*, Vol. 28, p. 123.

² *Ibid.*, p. 122.

³ *Lenin Miscellany XXI*, p. 252 (in Russian).

delivered from the capitalist yoke and subordinating its national interests to international objectives.

Nor did Soviet Russia fail in her internationalist duty to the Hungarian Soviet Republic, which existed for 133 days in the spring and summer of 1919. In the very first message congratulating the government of Soviet Hungary, Lenin wrote, "the working class of Russia is making every effort to come to your aid."¹ Defining the strategic tasks of the armed forces of the Soviet Ukraine, the closest to Hungary, in the ensuing months, he stressed the urgency of breaking through Bukovina and Galicia to the aid of the Hungarian Soviet Republic. Even after Denikin, the white-guard counter-revolutionary general had overrun a large section of the Ukraine, Lenin kept the item of military help to Soviet Hungary on the order of the day.

Soviet home and foreign policy was in every respect an embodiment of the internationalist duty of the Soviet working class and the Communist Party to all the oppressed and exploited and to the world revolutionary movement. And in reply, the working people of the world—from the industrial centres of the advanced capitalist countries to the remotest corners in colonies and dependent countries—expressed their deep sympathy to the Soviet country, manifested their solidarity, and refused to serve in the foreign interventionist forces. Not only the strength of the Red Army, but also the internationalism and courage of the revolutionary soldiers in the interventionist armies, Lenin pointed out, enabled Soviet Russia to gain its most important victory over the Entente, depriving it of soldiers—who had been shipped in to suppress the October Revolution but refused to fight against it.

No less important in this respect was the international solidarity of the working people in the capitalist countries: they helped frustrate imperialist conspiracies against the Soviet Republic, and provided tangible support by fighting for their own liberation from oppression and exploitation. The "Hands Off Soviet Russia!" campaign was very popular. Lenin said of it that the moment imperialism raised its arm against the Soviet land, it was handcuffed by its own workers. "...We did receive

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 197.

support of another kind," Lenin said, "which was not direct or swift—the sympathy of the workers and peasants, the farm workers, throughout the world, even in the countries most hostile to us, the sympathy that was great enough to be the final and most decisive source, the decisive reason for the complete failure of all the attacks directed against us."¹

The Soviets formed in many countries and the proclamation of Soviet republics, were acts of proletarian internationalism and of readiness to help Soviet Russia. One article of the Constitution of Soviet Hungary said that it "proclaims the principle of international proletarian solidarity", and another said the Hungarian Soviet Republic "seeks the union, the alliance of the proletarians of all countries, the formation of a World Soviet Republic of Working People". Speaking at a Congress of the Soviets of Hungary, T. Samuelli, a member of the Hungarian Soviet government, referred to "the duty of the Hungarian Soviet Republic to demonstrate its solidarity with the Russian Soviet Republic". His statement was met with stormy applause and shouts of "That's right!" He said: "One thing is certain—we have no right to abandon the struggle so long as the proletariat of Russia is in danger". Following the example of the Russian working class, the working people of Soviet Hungary displayed fidelity to proletarian internationalism, subordinating their national interest to the supreme international interest.

The struggle between the two social systems became a major aspect of state, and consequently of national, relations. This had a bearing on the content and forms of proletarian internationalism, and gave rise to new features after the October Revolution.

The practice of the revolutionary movement confirmed two earlier Marxist-Leninist propositions of proletarian internationalism.

Firstly, it confirmed the basic principle that no people can be free if it oppresses other peoples. This was a lethal blow to social-reformism, which had insisted, and still does, that developed capitalist countries could go over to socialism while keeping their colonies and oppressing other peoples, allegedly

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 145.

because this "helped" the latter to become civilised. Seeing from the Soviet example that it was necessary to liberate oppressed peoples as a condition of their own liberation, the workers in the developed imperialist states began devoting much more attention to the development of the national liberation struggle in the colonies and dependent countries. Naturally, this redoubled the motivation of revolutionaries in the colonies to seek alliance with the working-class movement in the metropolitan countries, and accelerated acceptance of proletarian internationalism by members of the national liberation movement.

Secondly, the October Revolution confirmed that the working people in a victorious proletarian dictatorship should regard their gains as a base for the proletarian world revolution and, therefore, place the international above their own national interests. The facts bore out Lenin's prediction of August 1915 that the proletariat that expropriates capitalists and organises socialist production will — since world capitalism is sure to try and suppress the socialist revolution — *confront* the rest of the capitalist world, and attract the oppressed classes of other countries, summoning them to insurrection against capitalists.¹

The early history of the Soviet state confirmed Lenin's ideas. The heroic deeds of the Russian revolutionaries and the unforgettable exploits of the early builders of socialism were inspired by the lofty internationalist duty of laying the foundations of socialist society for the rest of mankind. "In fighting for a socialist system in Russia," Lenin said in August 1918, "we are fighting for socialism all over the world."²

This is the explanation for the enthusiasm, the powerful wave of solidarity with Soviet Russia, that swept the world and provided living evidence of the growing significance of proletarian internationalism. "The workers of the whole world, no matter in what country they live," Lenin remarked, "greet us, sympathise with us, applaud us for breaking the iron ring of imperialist ties, of sordid imperialist treaties, of imperialist chains—for breaking through to freedom, and

¹ See *ibid.*, Vol. 21, p. 342.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 28, p. 82.

making the heaviest sacrifices in doing so—for, as a socialist republic, although torn and plundered by the imperialists, keeping *out* of the imperialist war and raising the banner of peace, the banner of socialism for the whole world to see.”¹

The workers of the world were aware that by defending the gains of the October Revolution the Soviet people were fighting for the common international cause of the oppressed and exploited, and not only for their own national interest. And when the “left” Communists, virtually bursting with revolutionary rhetoric, said that it was better to perish than to terminate the war against German imperialism, Lenin replied: “...Today the cause of socialism could suffer no heavier blow than the collapse of Soviet power in Russia.”² Later, he said that the workers of Russia had done well to perform their internationalist duty and sign the exorbitant Brest peace treaty. By so doing they saved what could still be saved, relinquishing space in exchange for time, using every minute of the breathing space they gained thereby to rally strength and consolidate the gains so essential for all working people, all the oppressed.

As once in Russia, the main problem that made the national question so difficult in the developed capitalist countries was the correlation between the bourgeois liberation movements of the oppressed nations and the proletarian liberation movement of the oppressor nations. This makes it important to pinpoint the changes that occurred in the first stage of the general crisis of capitalism in the life and development of the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries. The changes were traceable to three factors: the internal development of the peoples; the influence of the international working class movement; and the influence of the October Revolution and the revolutionary reconstruction in the Soviet country.

The national liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples led not only to national objectives, but also to a revolutionary break-up of the entire system of social relations. But national liberation was, of course, its top priority. This was due not only to the growing national oppression, but also to the stronger national consolidation of the peoples. The farther the develop-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 65.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 27, p. 61.

ment of capitalism advanced in the colonies, the more nationally conscious the peoples became, and the more solid became the bonds of the economic and cultural community of the peoples. In the final analysis this stimulated the urge to political independence.

It became clear at the very beginning of the first stage of the general crisis of capitalism that there were qualitatively new elements in the national liberation movement. A process was under way ending isolation of action in various countries. The struggle of all the peoples began to merge, growing into a component of the world revolutionary process. To a large extent this was facilitated by the close ties, and in many cases interdependence, of the international working class and the national liberation movement, with the former playing the determinative role, and the influence of the ideology of proletarian internationalism extending to the latter.

Following the outbreak of the First World War, armed uprisings erupted in many parts of the imperialist colonial system, and Lenin was able to draw the conclusion that "owing to the crisis of imperialism, the flames of national revolt have flared up *both* in the colonies and in Europe, and that national sympathies and antipathies have manifested themselves in spite of the Draconian threats and measures of repression".¹

The most striking example was the rising of the Irish against their English oppressors which, in effect, continued uninterruptedly from the spring of 1919 until the end of 1921, when the English imperialists were compelled to grant Ireland (excluding the six northern counties) dominion status. The national liberation war of the Turkish people lasted from 1918 to 1922, putting an end to the political domination of foreign powers and proclaiming a republic. Anti-imperialist struggle broke out in Iran, and national liberation made considerable gains. In 1919, Afghanistan, too, won political independence as the result of a national liberation war. And still more significant was the success of the Mongolian people, which broke away from the world capitalist system in 1921.

A battle for political independence also unfolded in Latin America, where many of the peoples came to grips with US

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 22, p. 354.

imperialism and succeeded in safeguarding their national statehood even though the United States occupied Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic and Haiti, and several times invaded Mexico.

In that new stage of the national liberation movement, the social element was much more prominent in relation to the national. Take the powerful uplift of the national liberation movement in China, India, Indonesia, Korea and other countries. The movement even spread to what were then relatively calm colonial areas, such as the Arab East, Tropical Africa, etc.

The impact of the revolutionary reforms in the Soviet country and direct Soviet aid to the oppressed peoples fighting for freedom and independence was of cardinal significance in the new stage of the national liberation movement.

The Soviet state exposed the secrets of colonial diplomacy. This was one of the first services it rendered to the national liberation movement of the imperialist-dominated peoples. More than a hundred secret treaties and agreements were made public under the epigraph, "Long live the brotherhood of all peoples!" The foreword to the collection said: "Let the working people of all the world know how their lives were sold behind their backs by diplomats in their working-rooms. They annexed lands. They enslaved small nations. They trampled upon them, oppressed them politically and economically. They concluded disgraceful treaties."¹

An indelible impression on the formerly oppressed peoples in Russia and on the imperialist-oppressed peoples of the world was made by the Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia, the Soviet government's address "To All the Working Moslems of Russia and the East", and the Declaration of the Rights of the Working and Exploited People. On taking power, the Bolsheviks put into effect one of the main principles of internationalism and took immediate steps to liberate the peoples formerly oppressed by Russia. The Soviet Republic repealed the tsarist treaties imposed on China, Iran and Afghanistan, gave up concessions and various property in

¹ *Sbornik sekretnykh dokumentov iz arkhiva byushego ministerstva inostrannykh dyel*, № 1, ed. 2, Petrograd, 1917, p. 2.

their territory, and, furthermore, granted material aid to some of them.¹

The sympathy for the workers and peasants of Russia, the makers of the October Revolution, the sincere wish to join them in battle, and the quick succession of revolutionary actions, chiefly in the big colonial cities, were all vivid examples of the closeness which the enslaved peoples felt for the Soviet country. Replying to the Soviet government's address to the Chinese people of July 25, 1919, the Chinese Association of Labour wrote: "We, the people of China, were exceedingly glad to receive your address; we know that your revolution is designed to restore our rights, the rights of working people, and to help the peoples of the world to acquire the bliss of freedom and equality." In India, a meeting of revolutionaries on February 17, 1920, addressed a resolution to Lenin. "The Indian revolutionaries," they wrote, "express their profound gratitude and admiration to Soviet Russia for its great struggle for the liberation of all oppressed classes and peoples, and, in particular, the liberation of India."² Lenin replied: "I am glad to hear that the principles of self-determination and the liberation of oppressed nations from exploitation by foreign and native capitalists, proclaimed by the Workers' and Peasants' Republic, have met with such a ready response among progressive Indians, who are waging a heroic fight for freedom."³

The revolutionary impact of the Great October Revolution, wrote Ho Chi Minh, "has made the patriots of Vietnam turn their eyes to the Soviet Union, accept the great teaching of Marxism-Leninism, and join actively in the revolutionary struggle."⁴

¹ The property transferred to Iran, for example, was valued at some 600 million gold rubles. The Soviet government also rendered substantial aid to peoples fighting for their national independence, and against imperialism: more than 11 million gold rubles to the Turkish people, and 620,000 gold rubles to the Iranian people. Soviet Russia supplied Turkey with arms for her liberation struggle, built several enterprises there, and helped out with personnel.

² *Pravda*, May 20, 1920.

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 138.

⁴ Ho Chi Minh, *Selected Articles and Speeches*, Moscow, 1959, p. 4 (in Russian).

The Communist and Workers' parties with their ideology of proletarian internationalism became the main link between the national liberation movement, the international working-class movement, and the world's first workers' and peasants' state. The working people of China, Turkey, Iran and Korea had representatives at the First Congress of the Communist International. By the end of 1920, Communist parties had been founded in Mexico, Indonesia, Iran, Turkey, Uruguay and Australia. The International-Socialist Party of Argentina announced its entry into the Comintern. In 1921, Communist parties were formed in China, South Africa, Palestine and New Zealand, and the following year in Brazil and Chile.

Under Lenin's leadership, the Communist and Workers' parties set their sights on uniting the international working-class movement with national liberation struggle of oppressed peoples. The Second Congress of the Comintern was important in this respect, adopting Lenin's motion that "the Communist International's entire policy on the national and the colonial questions should rest primarily on a closer union of the proletarians and the working masses of all nations and countries for a joint revolutionary struggle to overthrow the landowners and the bourgeoisie. This union alone will guarantee victory over capitalism, without which the abolition of national oppression and inequality is impossible."¹ Lenin stressed at the same time that since all world events after the October Revolution were inevitably centred on the struggle of world capitalism against the Soviet country, it was not enough to proclaim this aim, and that "a policy must be pursued that will achieve the closest alliance, with Soviet Russia, of all the national and colonial liberation movements".²

Consequently, the objectives of the working class had to be brought into line with the content of the new epoch. Lenin pointed out that "in the epoch of imperialism, owing to objective causes, the proletariat has been split into two international camps, one of which has been corrupted by the crumbs that fall from the table of the dominant-nation bourgeoisie—obtained, among other things, from the double

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 146.

² *Ibid.*

or triple exploitation of small nations — while the other cannot liberate itself without liberating the small nations, without educating the masses in an anti-chauvinist, i.e., anti-annexationist, i.e., 'self-determinationist', spirit".¹ By naming this the "principal" problem, Lenin drew special attention to exposing the policy of the social-reformists and social chauvinists.

The most typical feature of the national-colonial policy of Socialist and Social-Democratic parties that had fallen prey to social-chauvinism was that they completely ignored the interests of oppressed peoples. Many accepted Kautsky's idea that in the epoch of, what he called, ultraimperialism the main accent lay not on national independence but on conciliation with the allegedly natural course of capitalist development in the new stage, leading to the appearance of large empires which capitalism requires to achieve its last and highest stage of development, in which the proletariat will attain its ultimate aim. The decisions of the Berne Conference of the Second International in February 1919 were, in effect, based on this notion, ignoring the demand of the oppressed peoples for national independence and suggesting that these peoples should be placed in the trust of the big imperialist states.

The approach of the Right Social-Democrats was theoretically and politically untenable. They did not understand that the role of the small peoples in the capitalistically developed metropolitan region had changed. Together with the bourgeoisie, the Socialists of these smaller peoples were infected with great-power ideas, and in each case singled out their people as the decisive factor in the development of the region. In effect, they advocated ethnocentrism. They thought that despite the general crisis of capitalism the situation of the small peoples was the same as during the 1848-1871 bourgeois revolutions, when their role depended on whether they joined the forces of reaction or sided with the revolution. But Lenin showed that the determining role no longer belonged to either the big or the small nations, but to the division of the international working class into a revolutionary and an opportunistic part.

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 22, p. 343.

How much more importance Lenin attached to the international factor than the national one is seen from his firm opposition to so-called national communism. He attacked the very first manifestations of national communism, describing it as a departure from proletarian internationalism and showing that it ignored the objective laws governing the socialist revolution and the passage from capitalism to socialism.

The Hamburg organisation of the Communist Workers' Party of Germany, for example, was an exponent of national communism. It gave priority in its practical activity to the slogan of delivering Germany from the burdens imposed by the Versailles Treaty immediately after the socialist revolution. The slogan was proclaimed in total disregard of the historical situation and the general relation of strength, and ignored the effect this would have on the development of the world revolution.

"*In the present situation*", Lenin stressed, the main concern of the German Communists on achieving victory should be to "*facilitate and pave the way*" for an alliance with Soviet Russia, the first proletarian dictatorship. The Communists were "in no way obligated to repudiate the Treaty of Versailles, come what may, or to do so at once."¹ It was not enough, he said, to disavow national communism; it was important to understand that giving precedence to Germany's immediate deliverance from the Versailles Treaty over the liberation of other countries from imperialist oppression, was petty-bourgeois nationalism and not revolutionary internationalism.

Lenin's Bolshevik Party, the working class, the people of the Soviet Republic, were the model of genuine revolutionary internationalism. And in the capitalist world this "Russian model" made a strong impact on state and national relations, on all areas of home and foreign policy, including the question of nations and national relations. It a) deepened the split in the international imperialist camp, which weakened it and facilitated a closer union of the working class and all working people in their struggle for liberation, and b) helped shape a new type of international relations.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 76.

The content of the national question in the bourgeois world, objective though it was, changed quite substantially under the influence of Soviet home and foreign policy.

Rallying to safeguard the gains of the October Revolution, the Soviet people also acted in the interest of all mankind. The Brest peace, which deepened the rifts in the capitalist world and strengthened the hand of the international working-class movement, was one of the main blows delivered at the unity of the imperialist camp. And though in the war against bourgeois-landlord Poland the Soviet Republic was on the face of it only safeguarding its own security, that war, too, had a strong bearing on the relations between the states and nations of the capitalist world. Lenin said on this score that the successes of the Red Army had had so powerful an impact on Western Europe and the entire world situation that they completely upset the correlation between the belligerent internal and external political forces.¹ Elsewhere, referring to Soviet Russia's role in changing the content of the relations between the capitalist countries and the colonial peoples they oppressed, Lenin said at the end of 1920 that it had the effect of "steadily strengthening the alliance and the friendly relations between Russia and the oppressed nations of the East.... The chief factor in politics today is the violence being used by the imperialists against peoples which have not had the good fortune to be among the victors; this world policy of imperialism is leading to closer relations, alliance and friendship among all the oppressed nations".² In any capitalist country, Lenin said, the people "can, despite anti-Bolshevik prejudices, see that the Bolsheviks are establishing completely different international relations which make it possible for all oppressed peoples to rid themselves of the imperialist yoke".³ The new international relations, initiated by the foreign policy of the Soviet Republic, which compelled imperialism, naturally against its will, to facilitate rapprochement among peoples, also augmented the split in the ranks of the international bourgeoisie. "Our policy," Lenin said, "is grouping around the

¹ See *ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 276.

² *Ibid.*, p. 491.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 477-78.

Soviet Republic those capitalist countries which are being strangled by imperialism.”¹

Those were the changes in the content of the national question in the capitalist world. This was the substance of Lenin's policy of regulating the correlation between the national and the international factors in the life and liberation struggle of the peoples. “This skill, this ability never to isolate oneself in the national framework and at the same time, in the course of international events, use the movement within the framework of this or that nation to the utmost,” M. I. Kalinin pointed out at the Fifth Congress of the Comintern, “was Lenin's distinguishing feature. *Precisely* this made him the leader of the international, as well as the Russian, revolution.”²

Lenin's analysis of the national question in the bourgeois world leads to the conclusion that the new elements in it were: firstly, the changed correlation of the class and national factors, with the former superceding the latter; secondly, the national and international processes manifested themselves more frequently than before through the social aspects of the life of the peoples, rather than directly. This may be illustrated by examples of internationalism and the differentiation of forces inside the capitalist nations. After the October Revolution proletarian internationalism in capitalist society was much less a component of the national question, and manifested itself far more distinctly through the unity of the proletarian class struggle in different countries. But this did not make it less important as a factor of national relations. The “Hands Off Soviet Russia” movement, for example, left a lasting imprint on the class consciousness of the working people, as well as on their national relations. The differentiation of class forces inside nations was, likewise, not only a social phenomenon, but also a cardinal national process. The greater influence of the working class on the life of the nation during this differentiation signified an acceleration of national processes, and a strengthening of the international in their content.

¹ V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 477-78.

² M. I. Kalinin, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, Moscow, p. 517 (in Russian).

After the October Revolution the importance of proletarian internationalism greatly increased, because it had become evident that proletarian revolutions were also possible in many other countries. The Communist International put it thus: "The proletariat of different countries showed so much energy, such readiness for struggle, so much self-sacrifice, that they would have sufficed amply for a victorious revolution." However, subjective factors intervened. First, the uplift of the revolutionary movement (generated by the ripening of objective preconditions for socialist revolution) was so precipitous that, Lenin said in March 1919, the consciousness of the working masses may have lagged behind it. And Lenin's concern proved correct. Second, in the rest of Europe the emergence of genuinely internationalist proletarian parties that could have used the available opportunities to achieve victory proved slower than in Russia, because the consciousness of the proletarian masses lagged behind the vigorous growth of the class struggle. In October 1918, Lenin said that the absence of fully-formed revolutionary working-class parties was the greatest misfortune and menace for the proletarian revolution in Europe. He pointed out, moreover, that their revolutionism had to be complemented on all accounts by loyalty to proletarian internationalism, because the opportunist parties of the Second International had betrayed the workers' cause and had, to please their bourgeoisie, shifted to nationalism and social-chauvinism.

After the victory of the October Socialist Revolution loyalty to proletarian internationalism was measured by the attitude towards the Soviet Republic. Unconditional support, subordination of national interests to the international duty of safeguarding and consolidating the base of the world revolution, became the criterion of revolutionism. "*Unconditional support of Soviet Russia*," the Third Comintern Congress said in its resolution, "was and is the prime obligation of the Communists of all countries."

For the first time in the history of the liberation struggle against the capitalist yoke, proletarian internationalism began to exercise a tremendous influence on the content and scale of the national liberation movement. "World imperialism," Lenin wrote, "shall fall when the revolutionary onslaught of the

exploited and oppressed workers in each country, overcoming the resistance from petty-bourgeois elements and the influence of the small upper crust of labour aristocrats, merges with the revolutionary onslaught of hundreds of millions of people who have hitherto stood beyond the pale of history, and have been regarded merely as the object of history.”¹ The unity of the streams of the world revolutionary process, their mutual assistance in combatting imperialism, were unthinkable until proletarian internationalism spread to the national liberation movement. This, precisely, was secured by the October Revolution.

The correlation of the national liberation movement and the socialist world revolution changed, too. Firstly, the national liberation movement gained a greater specific weight. Secondly, its objective content changed; though it was not socialist, it blended with the general course of the world revolution and began to contribute to its victory.

Finally, the content of the national question in the bourgeois world was strongly influenced by the fact that the Soviet workers’ and peasants’ state born by the October Revolution, initiated a qualitatively new type of relations between states and between nations based on the principles of proletarian internationalism.

3. THE BUILDING OF SOCIALISM IN THE USSR AND CHANGES IN THE CONTENT OF THE NATIONAL QUESTION UNDER CAPITALISM

The changes in the development of nations and national relations in the capitalist world under the influence of the October Revolution became more profound as the general crisis of capitalism increased. The extensive modifications in the content of economic relations inside the world capitalist system, and likewise the building of socialism in the USSR, had a strong effect, too.

At that time, the development of nations and national relations in the capitalist world was governed, first and foremost, by objective changes in the world capitalist system. Central among these changes were the new tendencies Lenin

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 232.

discovered when it became clear that the principal capitalist powers had withstood the initial onslaught of the world revolution. Lenin predicted that since "the imperialists have succeeded in splitting the world into two camps", the West-European capitalist countries would "consummate their development towards socialism ... not as we formerly expected", that is, not only "through the gradual 'maturing' of socialism".¹ Apart from these cardinal factors, Lenin named two more with a bearing on the national question and its place and role in the world revolutionary process: a) growing exploitation of states by states—among the developed capitalist powers due to the inevitable growth of contradictions between them; and b) further intensification of the oppression and exploitation of colonial and dependent peoples.²

These tendencies in the capitalist world clearly increased the role of the national question and enabled the bourgeoisie to substitute national for class antagonisms. National relations became very acute, and the national dislike of the oppressed for the oppressor nations grew. Consequently, due to the new tendencies "the intensification and expansion of national oppression and colonial plunder"³ typical of imperialism became still more significant.

World capitalism won its reprieve at a high price. The intensification of national antagonisms led ineluctably to national liberation revolutions in colonies and dependent countries, and to possible national wars in the metropolitan countries (by peoples held in slavery by the biggest imperialist predators). But the bourgeoisie had no choice, and was prepared to pay the price in order to sidetrack, if only for a time, the main danger to itself—a social revolution of the proletariat and its allies.

As for Lenin's proposition concerning the "ripening" of socialism in developed capitalist countries, the bourgeoisie managed to hold it up by fanning national antagonisms and by other social manoeuvres. Lenin underscored the fact that

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 33, p. 499.

² See *ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 22, p. 143.

"owing to their victory,¹ a number of states, the oldest states in the West, are in a position to make some insignificant concessions to their oppressed classes—concessions which, insignificant though they are, nevertheless retard the revolutionary movement in those countries and create some semblance of 'class truce'."² In this, the right-wing Social-Democrats in all countries faithfully helped the capitalist class. Their social demagoguery, in fact, often went much farther than that of the capitalists. The concessions to the working people, especially in meeting their economic demands, were paid for largely by greater national oppression and colonial plunder. The policy of corrupting the workers, to which Marx once referred only in relation to England,³ was adopted in many developed capitalist countries, especially the United States. Bourgeois propaganda was centred on corrupting the thinking of the workers, contaminating them with racism and chauvinism, and sharpening antagonisms between the proletariat of the metropolitan countries and the colonial and dependent peoples.

After the revolutionary tide of 1917-1923 receded, national relations in the capitalist world were greatly affected by the economic and political consequences of the First World War as formalised in the Versailles Treaty, which contained the germ of new upheavals. Since the reactionary forces in the defeated countries used both the moral factor of the defeat and the victor countries' economic plunder as a means of shoring up capitalism, it was precisely there that new elements surfaced in the development of national relations. Somewhat later, these became ingredients of the fascist ideology and policy.

A turgid wave of chauvinism and preparations for revenge engulfed the defeated states, especially Germany, as soon as the guns of World War I had fallen silent, even before the conclusion of the Versailles peace. The economic hardships imposed at Versailles, which added to the hardships of the postwar years, and the instability of the political situation prompted the bourgeoisie to distract the masses from the social

¹ The reference is to the First World War.—*Ed.*

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, pp. 498-99.

³ See K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1965, p. 140.

realities and substitute national for social issues. And since all this blended with anti-Sovietism and reprisals against the slightest hint of revolutionary action, the policy of the bourgeoisie in the defeated countries met with the unqualified support of the victor powers. In Germany's case, for example, the economic impositions of the Versailles agreements were gradually relaxed, and the Dawes Plan became less a punishment of one of the culprits of the First World War and more a means for priming a new aggressor to attack the Soviet Republic. This resulted in the fact that, though born in Italy, fascism acquired its classic form precisely in Germany. Chauvinism and nationalism had from the outset played a central part in the evolution of fascism. This was true not only of Germany, whose reactionaries yearned for revenge and world supremacy, but also of other, more backward countries (Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and others), where the fascists proclaimed "the magnificent aim" of building a "modern nation". In Asia, it was the Japanese bourgeoisie that panted for this "aim".

The typical features of fascism are, on the one hand, complete suppression of democracy and, on the other, enlistment by the financial oligarchy of declassed elements, ruined petty-bourgeois, and others raised on racism, nationalism and outspoken chauvinism, to enforce a terroristic dictatorship.

Fascism opposed the creation of national states, and emasculated the idea of national sovereignty. The racial principle was made the basis of national relations, with the racially "select" and "pure" peoples ruling all other peoples. Not only in ideology, but also through Germany's state policy, the nazis "substantiated" the necessity of destroying all Jews, the Slav peoples, and others. They were deadly enemies of proletarian internationalism, and were infuriated by its spread. Even before he came to power, Hitler envisaged a programme of "liberating" Germans from the internationalist ideology, and set out to educate them consciously and systematically in a spirit of fanatical nationalism. We shall liberate our people, he said, "from believing in the reconciliation of nations, in world peace, in international alliance and international solidarity." He expressed his determination to destroy all these ideas.

In many ways, postwar economic and inter-state national relations bore the stamp of nationalism. The 17th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party took special note of the "extreme nationalism" of the major imperialist states, above all in their economic policy, and this not only in relation to the Soviet Union, but also to the same degree in relations between the main capitalist rivals. National hatred was stimulated continuously in Germany, Italy and Japan against the United States. The further growth of US imperialism, which held 56.1 per cent of the capitalist world's gold reserve by the autumn of 1938, and which actually ruled the world market and was predominant in many colonies, added fuel to the fire. The US monopolies were aware of this. However, they hoped to settle matters by pushing Germany and her satellites into a war against the Soviet Union. In the meantime, German, Italian and Japanese capital gladly accepted the support of American imperialism, but had no intention of limiting itself to the gains it would receive at the expense of the world's first socialist country. The law of uneven, leap-like development of capitalism was having its effect. Preparations were in train to re-divide the world among the imperialists themselves.

The rivalry between the United States, Britain and France, on the one hand, and the German-Italian-Japanese bloc, which was gathering strength, on the other, involved the purely economic sphere, but was no less acute in the political domain, with either grouping seeking to subordinate the lesser capitalist states. Naturally, this affected the national relations of the peoples. Take the bourgeois Baltic republics. They were all but semi-colonies of American-British-French capital, though, simultaneously, the influence there of German fascism, if only in the ideological field, was steadily growing. Some of the Central and East European countries, too, that had for long been the hunting ground of Britain and France, were gradually falling under German influence. This applied first and foremost to Hungary, Rumania, Poland and Bulgaria, and also largely to Finland and Yugoslavia.

Social demagoguery and nationalism enabled the bourgeoisie to put the brakes on the processes of class differentiation which had begun to unfold in the capitalist nations against the background of a mounting revolutionary crisis. In some

countries, in fact, especially those gravitating towards fascism, it had even been able artificially to solidify for a time the greatly weakened national community. The propaganda machine of monopoly capital worked overtime, seeking to obscure the social issues by national ones, and to conceal the internal class contradictions behind national antagonisms on the international scene.

Relations between capitalist countries over colonial issues, on the one hand, and between the capitalist countries and the peoples in colonies and dependent countries, on the other, figure quite prominently in the content of the national question. Even in the first stage of the general crisis of capitalism the role of economic factors in the relationship between the metropolitan and colonial countries began visibly to increase. Direct political rule in the colonies could weaken, and in some cases was altogether lacking, but this in no way reduced the colonial enslavement of the oppressed peoples. For example, even after having formally recognised the independence of Egypt and Iraq, Britain in effect continued to control their economy and thereby also the avenues of influencing their home and foreign policy. In the late 1920s and early 1930s the British dominions, too, were officially proclaimed independent as regards home and foreign policy, but huge investments and a system of economic agreements, especially their inclusion in the specially created sterling bloc, left Britain in control of numerous avenues to continue exploiting them.

And one more aspect. Though Britain remained the principal colonial power, and though it retained political rule in the colonies, the economic positions there were gradually being taken over by the US monopolies. In fact, they also took a firm grip on one of her dominions, Canada. All this added to Britain's dependence on the United States, where the press quite openly discussed the idea of Britain sooner or later becoming a US colony. Ludwell Denny says in his book, *America Conquers England*, which appeared in 1930: "We were Britain's colony once. She will be our colony before she is done: not in name, but in fact."¹

¹ Ludwell Denny in R. Palme Dutt, *Britain's Crisis of Empire*, N. Y., 1950, p. 43.

US-British rivalry was especially acute in the domain of capital exports, one of the main instruments of enslaving and plundering other nations. And the US monopolies were obviously ahead: by the beginning of the Second World War Britain accounted for only 10.3 per cent of the world export of capital, whereas the United States accounted for 13.5 per cent. Export of capital to the colonies, where exploitation of the local labour force yielded the highest profits, was especially advantageous. Take Britain: her investments in the colonies and dominions were only a little over half of her total investments abroad, but the profit she derived from them was in excess of two-thirds of the total. And it grew steadily: in 1912 it was £176 million, and in 1929 as much as £250 million. The intensity of exploitation in the colonies may be illustrated by the fact that the ratio of colonial revenue to expenditure in the British government's budget was 10.1:1.0.

These figures, of course, show not only the revenue and expenditure. They also show the monstrous scale of the exploitation and plunder of the colonial and dependent peoples, they show the extent to which it retarded—in combination with ruthless political oppression—the national consolidation of the oppressed peoples, the formation and development of nations, and their intercourse with other peoples. This exploitation enabled the British bourgeoisie to keep content the workers' aristocracy and the intelligentsia at home and win over a large section of the British people to its side in the struggle against the oppressed peoples fighting for liberation. This was how the national identity of exploiters and exploited was artificially accentuated, creating a semblance of "national peace".

Naturally, the above applied to all the colonial powers, big or small, including the United States, France, Holland, Portugal, Belgium, Spain, and others. They profited from colonies and dependent countries not only through direct political rule and huge investments, but also through non-equivalent commerce. The aggregate profit of the developed capitalist countries, which accounted for less than a fifth but exploited three-quarters of the world population, went up from \$ 8,500 million in 1914, to \$11,000 million in 1938.

The dependence of the Latin American peoples on the United States increased substantially. By 1940, total US monopoly investments in the region had grown to \$3,700 million, yielding annual profits of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Despite the ruthless colonial exploitation, however, the oppressed peoples did make some headway in national development. The national liberation struggle grew steadily. In the 1920s, the Latin American peoples, most of which had won their political independence much earlier, were drawn more distinctly into the mainstream of world history. In Asia, too, the movement grew rapidly, highlighted by the 1924-1927 revolution in China, the 1926 insurrection in Indonesia, and the upswing of the liberation struggle in India in 1928-1933. In many cases, the colonialists were forced to make concessions: Britain recognised Egypt's independence in 1922, and her mandate in Iraq was terminated in 1930.

In some of the Latin American countries, the US monopolies were unable to stem the popular drive for liberation led by left bourgeois parties, aimed at loosening the grip of foreign capital and at democratic reforms. This was the case in Bolivia, Paraguay, Mexico, Chile, and other countries. In 1932, for example, the national liberation movement in Chile even succeeded in forming a "socialist republic", which survived for 12 days; in 1938 a Popular Front government was formed. In Mexico a series of anti-imperialist measures spearheaded against US monopolies were taken in 1934-40, including nationalisation of foreign monopoly property, suspension of the state debt, etc.

The African continent was beginning to wake up. The famous Rif Republic in Morocco, which existed from 1921 to 1926, was a vivid event, followed by a liberation movement in 1930.

Examining the development of nations and national relations in the bourgeois world during the first stage of the general crisis of capitalism, we should not overlook the theoretical impotence and political short-sightedness of the Social-Democratic parties. With a membership of nearly seven million, and controlling some 25 million votes, they nonethe-

less almost entirely followed the lead of the bourgeoisie. In Austria, for example, the Social-Democratic Workers' Party virtually ignored the existence of an Austrian nation with centuries of national statehood. Even for some time after the October Revolution in Russia, the right-wing Social-Democrats continued to advocate "limited self-determination" for the peoples of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. That actually meant autonomy and preservation of a "united" country. Not until the end of 1918, when the peoples firmly expressed their will of self-determination, did the Social-Democratic Workers' Party follow the proposal of its left wing (headed by Otto Bauer, who then for a short time renounced the notorious "cultural-national autonomy" programme), underwriting the idea of self-determination. But for the Austrians themselves, the S.-D. leaders conceived self-determination as a half-measure, dreaming of Austria's *Anschluss* to Germany as a result of a victorious "all-German revolution".

The Social-Democrats of Austria did not understand the real national aspirations of their people, chiefly due to the limitations of their bourgeois ideology. Even the 1926 programme envisaged the "incorporation of German Austria into the German state" as a necessary condition for "completing the national revolutions of 1918". And only in October 1933, when the nazis had already come to power in Germany, an S.-D. party congress decided to delete this passage from its programme, declaring that "Social-Democracy demands an independent and self-reliant Austria".

The anti-popular substance of the outlook and activity of the right-wing Social-Democrats in the West was revealed during the discussion of the colonial question at the Marseilles Congress of the so-called Labour and Socialist International in 1925. The Belgian Socialist, L. Piérard, probably expressed the general view by saying apropos of the Franco-Spanish colonial war against the people of Morocco: "...there is nobody here who will regard the question in the primitive and simple fashion of the Communists, whose solution is nothing more nor less than the immediate evacuation of that area."¹ The

¹ J. Lenz. *The Rise and Fall of the Second International*. N.Y., 1932, p. 249.

Dutch Socialists said economic independence of oppressed peoples was possible even before the withdrawal of colonialists, and went on to declare achievement of political sovereignty as the supreme form of independence. The French Socialists suggested "political assimilation of natives with Europeans", and thus ignored the struggle of the oppressed peoples for national independence and the nation-forming processes in the enslaved countries. The resolution of the Marseilles Congress said that granting political independence should be in the sole competence of the League of Nations, though it was common knowledge that the decisive vote there belonged to the colonialists.

Only the working class headed by Communist parties, brought together in the Communist International, took a truly progressive stand on the national question. Lenin's approach—to take into account the national interest of peoples while recognising the necessity of the workers' international unity in the struggle against monopoly capital—was decisive in shaping their attitude.

The working class and its parties did their utmost in the complicated situation of the first stage of the general crisis of capitalism to direct the development of national and international processes towards social progress. For example, the working class showed deep consideration for the development of nations and nationalities in Yugoslavia, and for the further development of the Austrian and Irish nations. The Communist Party of the United States devoted considerable attention to the Black question. In 1930, realising that the Black question was not a purely class issue, it demanded equal rights for American Blacks throughout the country and the right to self-determination in the Black Belt. The Communists were the first in the history of the United States to raise the question of Black liberation in earnest, which at once placed them in the vanguard of the fighters against oppression and exploitation.

In contrast to the bourgeoisie, which sought to maintain unity of the nation while totally ignoring the class interests of the masses, the Fourth Congress of the Comintern on Lenin's initiative framed a programme for uniting the majority of the nation round the proletariat on a class basis. It was embodied

in the slogan of a workers' government, flowing from the tactics of united popular front (led by the working class), as a possible form of subsequent passage to proletarian dictatorship. This also implied the spread of the ideology of proletarian internationalism to the general democratic movement. The successes of the working class in capitalist countries in combatting chauvinism and nationalism, in reconciling the working people of different nations on an internationalist basis, were facilitated by the activity of the Comintern, the Young Communist International, the Trades Union International, and other international organisations. This was most clearly evident in the struggle against fascism and imperialist colonial wars.

The Soviet Union and socialist construction by the multinational Soviet state made a tremendous impact on the thinking of working people in capitalist countries, promoting proletarian internationalism, and influencing the content of the national question in the capitalist world. This influence took many directions: the fulfilment of their international duty by the people of the USSR was tied in with the international unity of the working class; the solution of the national question in the Soviet Union showed the working class in capitalist countries, colonies and semi-colonies, how the true national interests of their peoples can be protected; the unity of the developed Soviet nations with the peoples of the more backward former national areas exemplified the forms and methods of struggle for a united anti-imperialist front of the working people of metropolitan and colonial countries under the leadership of the working class.

One of the ways of promoting the international unity of working people in capitalist countries—and consequently of uniting peoples by overcoming the national antagonisms artificially created by monopoly capital—was to cultivate among millions of working people a truly internationalist attitude towards the Soviet Union and an understanding of the Soviet people's international duty.

Following the grim civil war years, Lenin defined the building of socialism as the main international task of the people of the Soviet Republic. "We are now exercising our main influence on the international revolution," he said in

June 1921, "through our economic policy."¹ This is an important point, because the building of the foundations of a socialist economy in the Soviet Union under Lenin's plan was at that time portrayed by Trotskyites in the Soviet Communist Party and the Comintern as a renunciation of internationalism. They said it amounted to the people's concern for solely their own wellbeing, while ignoring their international duty. Trotsky produced a "theory" which described building socialism in the framework of a national state following the victory of a socialist revolution, as a totally hopeless venture. Such attempts, he maintained, would set individual countries apart from the single worldwide whole and retard the growth of the world's productive forces.

The indisputable fact that internationalisation has invaded all spheres of society throughout the world, and principally the sphere of production, led Trotsky to conclude that the international should exist without the national. Hence his idea that the formation of national states was "profoundly reactionary". Independence and national sovereignty, as he saw it, were outdated, the nation-state "had become a brake on the development of the productive forces", a "vise on development". He wrote in 1928 that since the Comintern Programme acknowledged national elements alongside international ones, and since embodiment of the international is envisaged in national frameworks, the "spine of internationalism is broken". "Unshakeable confidence that the main class aim ... cannot be achieved by national means", he said, is the "pivot of revolutionary internationalism".

Coming to grips with Trotsky's ideas, the Soviet Communist Party and the Marxist-Leninist parties of the Communist International upheld the internationalist essence of socialist construction in the USSR. The Seventh Extended Plenary Meeting of the Comintern's Executive Committee inscribed in its resolution at the end of 1926: "...The Soviet country is objectively the main organising centre of the international revolution."² And the 7th Comintern Congress in 1935

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 437.

² *The Communist International: Documents*, p. 680 (in Russian).

commended the Soviet people still more explicitly for performing their internationalist duty, chiefly by building socialism in the USSR. "*With the victory of socialism,*" one of its resolutions said, "*the USSR has become a great political, economic and cultural state force which influences world policy. It has become the centre of attraction and the rallying point for all peoples, countries and even states which are interested in the preservation of international peace. It has become the stronghold of the working people of all countries against the menace of war. It has become a mighty weapon for rallying the working people of the whole world against world reaction.*"¹

Through the Trades Union International, and often directly as well, the Soviet Union gave active support to the class struggle of the workers in capitalist countries. Suffice it to recall the solidarity with the general strike of the British miners, when Soviet workers collected 11.5 million rubles in gold for the strikers' fund, which amounted to nearly two-thirds of the total contributions. At the time of the economic crisis that shook the capitalist system in 1929-33, Soviet orders assured jobs for thousands upon thousands of its class brothers abroad. Tens of thousands found a temporary shelter and work at Soviet enterprises.

The international proletariat, too, considered it a sacred obligation to support the Soviet Union, the building of socialism by its people under the leadership of the Communist Party. Time and again the imperialists tried to obstruct socialist construction in the USSR by refusing credits and loans, and striving to turn the Soviet Union into a source of raw materials for the developed capitalist countries. They organised provocations on the Soviet borders, and sponsored "crusades" against the USSR. But every time the international proletariat rose to the defence of the world's first socialist state.

The constant internationalist unity of the working class in capitalist countries with the Soviet Union was a factor which forced the imperialists to make substantial concessions at home — establishing labour legislation, raising wages, limiting working hours, and the like.

¹ 7th Congress of the Communist International, Moscow, 1939, p. 602.

The support of Republican Spain in her heroic struggle against the Italo-German intervention and the home-grown fascist, General Franco, was an impressive display of proletarian internationalism. Workers and progressives in all parts of the world gave a helping hand to their class brothers. Volunteers came to Spain from 54 countries to defend her freedom and independence. International brigades were formed, named after Garibaldi, Dombrowski, Lincoln, Shevchenko, Chapayev, Thaelmann, Dimitrov, and others. And a decisive role in this aid belonged to the Soviet Union. Soviet arms, volunteers and food supplies arrived in a steady flow. And children of Spanish Republicans found asylum in the USSR. The solidarity of the Soviet peoples with the people of Spain, their effective material aid to the Republican Government and its armed forces, Dolores Ibarruri said, was of the utmost importance. The working people of Spain learned from experience the meaning of proletarian internationalism, and understood the significance of the Soviet Union for the emancipation struggle of the working class in all countries.

Thus, Lenin's strategy and tactics, and loyalty to proletarian internationalism, conditioned the incontestable fact that though the Soviet people and the international working-class movement had different immediate objectives, they were, in effect, doing one and the same thing: assuring the further development of the world revolutionary process, undermining the foundations of capitalism, and working for the continuous consolidation of socialism.

The zigzag course of the world revolutionary process in the 1920s and 1930s slowed down the development of the international working-class movement. But its other two streams—consolidation of socialism, and the national liberation movement—grew precipitously. In the Soviet Union socialism was built in something like 15 years following the armed struggle against the domestic counter-revolution and the foreign intervention. The national liberation movement, too, grew at an extraordinary rate. Lenin predicted this as the main evidence of the decay of the capitalist world. "The onslaught of the forces of the oppressed colonies, which have a population of over a thousand million," he said in June 1921,

"is increasing from year to year, month to month, and even week to week."¹

In their struggle for liberation and in working out their own ideals of a peaceful life after flinging off the colonial yoke, the oppressed peoples looked up at the example of the Soviet Union. The courage of the Soviet people in repulsing their enemies and building a new life was an inspiring example for all anti-imperialist fighters.

Rabindranath Tagore, who visited the Soviet Union in the autumn of 1930, was delighted to find that in building socialism the Soviet people were imbued with ideals that he had himself nourished for dozens of years. He was delighted to find that the common good of all mankind, rather than narrow national interests, motivated the Soviet people's effort to put the great dream into practice.

Inspired by Soviet success, leaning on Soviet aid, the oppressed peoples expanded their liberation struggles, making the blows they struck at imperialism ever more deadly.

The Soviet Communist Party's solution of the national question was of special value. The CPSU substantiated in theory and implemented in practice, on the basis of the Soviet system, the consolidation and development of backward peoples from a tribal and feudal condition into nations and nationalities of the socialist type, transformed nations that had formed under the old system, and showed the essence of nations and national relations in the environment of socialist and communist construction.

Despite the specific content of the national question in the USSR, the solution provided by the CPSU facilitated the liberation struggle of oppressed peoples and the relevant theoretical and practical activity of fraternal Communist and Workers' parties. Participating in the Communist International's analysis of the national liberation movement, the Soviet Communists emphasised the importance of determining its character and motive forces, and the forms and methods fraternal parties should employ in directing the liberation struggle of oppressed peoples. This was exceedingly difficult

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, pp. 436-37.

to accomplish, and the search for the best solutions took several years.

Right up to the 7th Comintern Congress in 1935, many Communists understood Lenin's views on the national-colonial question much too literally. Lenin's ideas that the colonies were "inexorably and with mounting momentum ... approaching their 1905",¹ for example, was interpreted to mean that the next stage of the national liberation movement would correspond to the 1905-1907 bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia. It was also assumed that the regimes established by the oppressed peoples following the victory would necessarily be of a purely social character, and amount to a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. There was a certain departure, in effect, from Lenin's idea, endorsed by the Second Comintern Congress, that Communists should enter into a temporary alliance with bourgeois democrats in colonies and backward countries.² Some Comintern leaders trimmed this down to connote alliance solely with the petty-bourgeoisie of colonies and dependent countries. In August-September 1928 the 6th Comintern Congress declared that "the national bourgeoisie lacks the significance of a force fighting against imperialism".³ These views surfaced, firstly, because at a certain point following Lenin's death the significance of the national question in colonies and dependent countries was underestimated by some Communist leaders, who regarded the struggle of oppressed peoples almost exclusively as a struggle for social emancipation, and, secondly, because the nature of the world revolutionary process in the new stage was conflicting and exceedingly complex. The attitude of some revolutionaries, for example, was affected by the betrayal of the Chinese people by Chiang Kai-shek and the national bourgeoisie, and also the latter's shift rightwards in other countries. This is why the 6th Comintern Congress drew what was on the whole a fallacious conclusion, albeit with some reservations, that the liberation struggle of oppressed peoples was, even in those days, an immediate premise for socialist

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 33, p. 350.

² See *ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 150.

³ *The Communist International: Documents*, p. 850 (in Russian).

revolution. Hence the erroneous behaviour of some Communist parties vis-à-vis the national bourgeoisie in colonies and dependent countries. Hence their refusal to participate in the national liberation movement led by the national bourgeoisie.

However, most of the decisions of the Comintern congresses on this score were essentially Leninist and correct. Take the mobilisation of the working class in the developed capitalist countries to aid the Chinese revolution, and the definition of its strategic and tactical line. Time and again, the Communist International corrected the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, and firmly rejected the absurd proposals of Trotsky and his followers. Trotsky had approached the programme commission of the 6th Comintern Congress with a proposal to accept as the basis for the national liberation movement his "theory" that socialism cannot win in one country and that all national revolutions were socialist in character. The Congress delegates censured Trotsky's anti-Lenin standpoint and rejected his charges against the Soviet Communist Party. The statements of the Turkish, Persian, Syrian, Egyptian and several other delegations, made at the sitting on August 28, 1928, rejected the charge of "national narrowness" levelled at the Soviet Communists and stressed that their peoples had learned from their own experience that the USSR is the bulwark of the "international working-class movement and the liberation movement of the colonial countries". This was seconded by the Communist delegations from Latin America, South Africa, New Zealand, Canada, and a few others, who commended the political support "rendered by the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) to all the oppressed peoples, and especially the Chinese revolution". The delegations of China, India, Japan, Indonesia and other Eastern countries said that the socialist construction in the USSR was inspiring the proletariat of the capitalist countries and all oppressed peoples to fight for liberation, "because the labouring masses in the colonies see with their own eyes that only in alliance with and under the leadership of the proletariat can they, like the USSR, achieve their liberation in fighting for socialism".

A close examination of the national liberation movement in various countries and entire continents helped the Commun-

ists to work out a correct idea of the place and role of the national question in the liberation struggle of oppressed peoples. The 7th Comintern Congress in July-August 1935 played an important part in this. First, the significance of the national question, of the oppressed peoples' struggle against foreign imperialism and for free national development and political independence, was strongly emphasised. Second, it was noted that the temporary emphasis on the national question helped unite diverse social forces, including the intelligentsia and national bourgeoisie, and thus form an anti-imperialist national front. Third, it was acknowledged that for backward and underdeveloped countries several transitional stages were inevitable on the way to socialism. Special significance was attached to the possibility of a non-capitalist way.

The parties in the Communist International overcame the ultra-leftist views that had surfaced in some of them and embarked on regular organisational work to mobilise the masses in colonies and dependent countries for the struggle against foreign rule and for a new life.

The persevering efforts of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist parties to implement Lenin's national-colonial doctrine required close study of the correlation of the national and international factors. The Comintern censured those who over-stressed national peculiarities, slipping into nationalistic postures. Yet the national freedom of their people was a matter of great concern for the Communist parties and the working class. The 7th Comintern Congress said in its resolution that "while Communists are irreconcilable opponents, on principle, of bourgeois nationalism of every variety, they are by no means supporters of national nihilism, of an attitude of unconcern for the fate of their own people".¹ The working class, the Congress stressed, is the sole and genuine fighter for the national freedom and independence of its people.

Mindful of Lenin's idea that the unity of the international tactics of the communist and working-class movement requires not the elimination of national distinctions but skilled use of the basic principles of communism with careful consideration

¹ 7th Congress of the Communist International, p. 581.

for national and national-state distinctions, Georgi Dimitrov said at the 7th Comintern Congress that "*national forms* of the proletarian class struggle and of the labour movement in the individual countries are in no contradiction to proletarian internationalism; on the contrary, it is precisely in these forms that the *international interests* of the proletariat can be successfully defended".¹

4. SPECIAL FEATURES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONS AND NATIONAL RELATIONS IN THE SECOND STAGE OF THE GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

The two decades of the second stage of the general crisis of capitalism—from the end of the 1930s to the end of the 1950s—witnessed substantial changes in the development of nations and national relations in the capitalist world. The beginning of the period saw a sharp aggravation of capitalist contradictions and an intensification of oppression and exploitation in colonies and dependent countries, and also the enslavement of many free peoples. The end of the period, on the other hand, was marked by a swift disintegration of the imperialist colonial system, traceable to the emergence of the world socialist system and the swift rise of the national liberation movement.

Even at the end of the first stage there had been evidence of a new and more serious split of the capitalist world, certain to affect the national factor in the life of peoples, and the entire system of international relations. The blame for this falls, first and foremost, on Germany, Italy and Japan, the signatories of the so-called anti-Comintern Pact, which set the aim of redividing the world. They did not intend to confine themselves to taking over the colonies, markets and sources of raw material of the Anglo-French-American grouping. They were set on a new, still more complete pattern of enslaving, in some cases even exterminating, the peoples.

In the East, the crusade for a new redivision was started by imperialist Japan. Her rulers had been preparing the nation

¹ 7th Congress of the Communist International, p. 182.

for this for a long time by inculcating a rabid, near-fanatical chauvinism, fanning hate of other peoples, and proclaiming Japan's "right" to dominate Asia. China became the object of the Japanese militarists' special attention. A war of conquest against her was begun in 1931.

The war perverted the minds of the working people of Japan. They exaggerated the national factor and broke off existing international ties. In China, on the other hand, the threat to the national existence of that great nation generated national feelings and national consciousness, accelerated national consolidation, and created an urge for unity with other peoples, especially the Soviet Union.

The popular masses were summoned to battle against the Japanese invaders under the three people's principles of Sun Yat-sen — nationalism, democracy and livelihood. Mounting a strong drive for a united anti-Japanese national front, the Communist Party of China supported these principles. Following the expansion of the Japanese aggression in 1937 the 5th Plenum of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party adopted a special decision on the second stage of cooperation with the Kuomintang. In the following year, the 6th Plenum made a special study of nationalism and its role in the national liberation movement of the Chinese people.

Radical changes occurred in Europe, and largely also in Africa, in the latter 1930s. First Italy started a war to conquer Abyssinia, then Germany and Italy jointly crushed the democratic republic in Spain, whereupon fascist Germany seized Austria and subjugated Czechoslovakia. Even before the Second World War, Germany and Italy demanded a redivision of colonies. In the beginning of 1939, Hitler declared in the Reichstag that Germany "cannot live without colonies". So, nazi Germany mounted a battle for world supremacy. In the meantime, Italy tendered a series of demands to Britain and France.

When the Second World War broke out many peoples were in danger of enslavement, even total extermination. The facts confirmed Lenin's words that "when the nation is in danger, the bourgeoisie is unable to govern".¹ Part of the bourgeoisie in the European countries entered into collusion with the nazis,

deliberately betraying their countries. The other part first adopted a wait-and-see policy, and only later in some form joined its people's struggle for freedom and independence. Not surprisingly, the leading role of the bourgeoisie in the life of nations began sharply to decline, shifting gradually to the working class, which assumed leadership in the struggle for liberation.

Once again, the Socialists and Social-Democrats displayed their indifference to their peoples' national interests. Some of their leaders began to collaborate with the fascists, such as Léon Blum of France. Others, like Edvard Beneš, though they spoke of battling for freedom, did precious little to this effect when their countries were occupied, taking shelter abroad. And some, among whom was Otto Bauer, confined themselves to merely a moral condemnation of fascism. Even after he realised that the Soviet Union was the only force able to crush German fascism, Bauer maintained in his polemics with the Communists that a national war for Austria's independence was unnecessary and opposed the tactics of uniting the nation's progressive forces in the Resistance. To his dying day he did not understand the real place of the national question in society, and denied the existence of an Austrian nation.

The Trotskyites, too, like all the other opportunists and revisionists, impeded the Communists' efforts to forge national unity, to assure national freedom and independence. They espied a positive factor in the nazi enslavement of European nations. Hitler's conquests, they argued, "were destroying nation-state partitions". They were not interested in the unity of the progressive forces. They hoped that nazi brutality and Hitler's manhating policy would ignite a proletarian revolution and thereby confirm their theory, placing them at the head of the working class.

The Trotskyites' bankruptcy in the national question, as well as the strategy and tactics of proletarian revolution, was final. Meanwhile, the facts confirmed Marxism-Leninism, the programme propositions of the Communist parties.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 243.

"We have not seen a real war, a war in which the people really participated in the centre of Europe for several generations,"¹ wrote Frederick Engels in 1870. Lenin concurred and pointed out that when Napoleon was building the French empire by conquering some of Europe's large and long since formed national states, the French national wars turned into wars of conquest, which, in turn, generated national liberation wars against France. Relating this thesis to the imperialist epoch, he drew the conclusion that in the new conditions "it is highly improbable" that an imperialist war would turn into a national one "for the class that represents *progressive* development is the proletariat which is objectively striving to transform it into a civil war against the bourgeoisie".² Yet highly improbable though it was, the change was not impossible. The survival of capitalism, for, say, another two decades, Lenin pointed out in 1916, and the consequent probability that imperialists would enslave a few more viable national states, could again ignite great national wars. "It would hurl Europe *back* several decades," Lenin said (implying that a civil war by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie would be a *forward* development). "That is improbable. But *not* impossible, for it is undialectical, unscientific and theoretically wrong to regard the course of world history as smooth and always in a forward direction, without occasional gigantic leaps back."³

History has confirmed Lenin's prediction and, moreover, his timing: precisely two decades later the European peoples fought national wars against fascist enslavement. Yet even when the survival of highly developed and viable nations hung in the balance, the bourgeoisie, in effect, proved incapable of assuming leadership in the wars of national liberation. It was the working class, headed by its Marxist-Leninist parties, that organised them. In France, Greece, Italy, Albania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Norway, and in all the other nazi-oppressed European countries, the working class and its Communist parties became the conductors of resist-

¹ Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 17, S. 197.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 309.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 22, p. 310.

ance, of the will to recover freedom and national independence.

The working class, its Marxist-Leninist parties, were the force that forged national unity, while the isolation of the bourgeoisie increased and national leadership gradually passed to the working class. It was thanks to the Soviet victories in the Second World War, to the participation of the masses in combating fascism, that the states which had emerged as a result and under the influence of the October Revolution—Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Hungary, and others—managed to regain their freedom and independence, along with states hundreds of years old.

During the Second World War the national factor gained in significance for the European peoples, and also, quite considerably, for many of the colonies and dependent countries. This was due mainly to radical changes in the life of the peoples and in their national consciousness. Colonial rule had become slacker, and the chances of the national liberation struggle had grown. The economic and political development of some peoples, modifications in the social structure, especially the emergence of a national bourgeoisie and a working class, the appearance of mass organisations uniting the fighters for national liberation—these were the internal factors that mobilised forces to fight for independence. In addition there were many external factors: the war victories of the anti-Hitler coalition, and the consolidation of the Soviet Union, followed by the emergence of the world socialist system. This radically altered the conditions and added to the chances of national liberation revolutions.

In 1943, the year of the big change on the Soviet-German front and of the uplift of the liberation struggle in nazi-occupied lands and other oppressed regions, Lebanon and Syria won national independence, liberating themselves from French colonialism. The national bourgeoisie came to power there with the support of the masses.

The national liberation movement in China, Korea and Vietnam, where the anti-imperialist front was headed by the working class and its parties, was far deeper in social content, and the spectrum of participants was much broader. The victory of the Soviet Army over imperialist Japan prevented

international imperialism from blocking the development of national-democratic revolutions in these three countries into socialist revolutions.

The situation in Indonesia, India, Burma and a few other countries was more complicated. Due to their socio-economic development the reins fell into the hands of the national bourgeoisie, which operated in some cases hand in hand with the compradore element and even with part of the feudal element. The idea of national liberation united widely diverging social groups, thus assuring victory over the colonialists.

The cardinal significance of the national factor was strikingly evident after the Second World War. Especially in Asia. In addition to the countries already listed, Jordan, the Philippines, Ceylon and Laos gained independence in the late 1940s. The Indian Republic was born, and with it Pakistan, part of the former British colonial possession. True to the divide-and-rule principle, the British colonialists hoped to retain their influence on the sub-continent by exploiting religious differences.

As the second stage of the general crisis of capitalism unfolded in the postwar period, greater significance attached to the new balance of class forces on the international arena, on the one hand, and to the changes in the economic relations of peoples in the capitalist world, on the other. The rift between the oppressor and oppressed nations grew deeper. The oppressed peoples demanded the right to self-determination more emphatically, and the attitude to this of political parties and mass organisations largely determined the degree of their influence over the masses. These were main indicators of the crisis gripping the imperialist colonial system.

Throughout the second stage of the general crisis of capitalism monopoly capital endeavoured to overcome its difficulties by intensifying the exploitation of colonies and dependent countries. Take Britain, France and the United States. Britain did so despite the 1940 Colonial Development and Welfare Act. The goods and services she received free from the colonies in 1939-1948 added up to £600 million, while her expenditures in 47 colonial territories under the above Act totalled a mere £25.6 million.

Britain's status in her colonial possessions was greatly undermined by the Second World War. She was compelled to expend a quarter of her overseas investments, with revenue declining from £175 million in 1938 to £50 million in 1948. The national liberation movement compelled her to make concessions and grant independence to the oppressed peoples. But this was only the beginning. Everything was done to preserve, even consolidate, the existing positions. The British government spared no means for this purpose. Spending went up steeply in 1948 compared with ten years before. And wherever Britain failed to retain the political grip, she tried to strengthen her economic influence. As a consequence, 40 per cent of the national income of £17,600 million in 1957 was from revenue in colonies and dependent countries.

French imperialism was much less flexible. Much more frequently than the British, it accepted confrontations with the oppressed peoples, and waged long colonial wars. The colonial wars in Vietnam and Algeria lasted nearly eight years. As a result, the victorious culmination of liberation struggles in some of the colonies also meant an end to economic and political ties with the former metropolitan country.

As before, in a "very peculiar" way, as Lenin once said, US imperialism continued plundering colonial and dependent peoples. This was peculiar, because the USA had very few colonies in the accepted sense of the word, as compared with, say, Britain. Neither did US monopoly capital wage any long colonial wars, like the French imperialists. Yet in the second stage of the general crisis of capitalism, especially after the Second World War, US imperialism quickly developed into colonialist No. 1, which substantially affected national relations.

Formally, Britain was still the main colonial power. By the end of the Second World War she still had a colonial empire of 14 million sq. miles and a population of 550 million. The US colonies were only of 125,000 sq. miles, with a population of 19 million. But with national liberation revolutions on the upgrade, the old colonialism was no longer suitable. It had to be modified. And US imperialism managed this best of all. While supporting the peoples in their struggle for liberation from colonial oppression in word, the US imperialists set out to

enslave both big and small peoples economically. By the end of the Second World War US monopolies controlled 60 per cent of the capitalist world's production capacity and 73 per cent of the investments. Their positions grew still stronger, as attested by the growth of US investments, whose share in the world exports of capital more than quadrupled between 1938 and 1947.

One of the features of the steadily growing colonial plunder engaged in by US imperialism during the second stage of the general crisis of capitalism was the ousting of Britain from her colonies and dominions. While the share of US capital abroad grew steeply, the export of British capital remained at the prewar level. As we have noted, the volume of British capital in colonies and dependent countries had diminished by one-fourth during the war. Estimates for 10 British colonies in 1938-1947 showed that Britain's export of capital there increased three-fold, while that of US capital 7.5-fold. The growth of US investments in Latin America was especially swift.

Foreign trade is another basic field in which imperialists plunder colonies and dependent countries. Artificial depression of prices on the latter's products and inflated prices for commodities produced by the developed capitalist states, the resulting dollar "hunger" and many other forms of colonial plunder, became commonplace. How this affected the colonies and dependent countries will be seen from the fact that in 1952, for example, their exports declined by \$2,900 million against the previous year. Dumping a vast amount of raw materials from its reserves in 1951-1952, the United States reduced the currency reserves of 30 colonial and dependent countries by nearly one-third in just a bit over a year. This led to a decline of the share of Asia, Africa and Latin America in world exports from 28.5 per cent in 1950 to 20.2 per cent in 1962 and 19 per cent in 1967.

It was mainly in the second stage of the general crisis of capitalism that there came into being the system of unequal international division of labour which secured the economic dependence of peoples that had won political independence. Its substance stemmed not only from the growth of investments and from non-equivalent exchange, but also from

various types of loans, credits and the loudly advertised imperialist "aid" to underdeveloped countries. The colonialists' "civilising" mission was naturally an outright lie. But this does not alter the fact that the imperialists drew the oppressed peoples into the world economy and, therefore, even by candidly colonialist methods of "aid", loans, and the like, stimulated, quite against their own will, the forces fighting against colonialism. For there had already appeared people in colonies and dependent countries who understood the substance of the changes taking place in the world and were able to outline the ways of struggle for economic, as well as political, independence. It is not difficult, for example, to see the true implications of the US "aid" to the peoples of 20 Latin American countries: it amounted to \$210 million in 1946-1951, whereas US monopoly profits in those countries only from direct investments amounted to nearly \$1,000 million in the one year of 1951.

The economic plight of the newly-independent peoples was often so grievous that international imperialism had no trouble influencing their policy through loans and credits. In 1955, the debt of the underdeveloped peoples totalled \$7,000 million, and in 1973 as much as \$80,000 million. Moreover, by 1973 their annual outlays in interest and repayment had risen to \$7,000 million.

This was due, among other things, to the weakness of the national bourgeoisie. In the mid-1950s, only 8 per cent of all private investments in Algeria belonged to the local bourgeoisie, and only 10 per cent of industry and trade. In Tunisia, only 33 enterprises out of 290 with more than 50 workers belonged to Tunisians. Even Ghana, which had opted for independent development after liberation and blocked diktat by foreign capital, was compelled to pay for three-quarters of her economic development with loans and credits from imperialist states.

This was how neo-colonialism came into being already in the second stage of capitalism's general crisis. It is based on economic enslavement of colonies and dependent peoples. Of course, it is also accompanied by many political "innovations" in the relations between oppressor and oppressed nations. Britain, for example, prevailed on the dominions to rename

the British Empire into the British Commonwealth. To maintain the ephemeral unity of exploiters and exploited, the French imperialists, too, performed complicated manipulations with the name of their state in the postwar period. In 1946 France and her possessions were renamed the French Union, and her colonies were named overseas territories. In 1958, a broadly publicised "theory" of the interdependence of the French people and the peoples of the French colonies materialised into an appropriately prepared referendum which helped to create the so-called Franco-African Community.

This does not mean that neo-colonialism became the substance of all relations between oppressor and oppressed nations. The old methods facilitating enslavement—colonial wars, armed coups, "divide and rule", and imposed alliances—were still in use. Britain fought a long colonial war in Malaya, and Holland in Indonesia. Putsches organised by US monopolies were a common occurrence in Latin American countries. Among the most conspicuous was the demolition of the bourgeois-democratic system in Guatemala. The British colonialists created the Malayan and Central African federations in defiance of what the people there really wanted.

But most prominent in the sphere of the national question during this second stage of capitalism's general crisis were attempts to "substantiate" neo-colonialism and win acceptance in ideology for economic and political subjugation. Many of the peoples that had won political independence in circumstances of extreme economic, political and cultural backwardness, had to choose between the capitalist and socialist ways of development. Having done their utmost to hitch the young national states economically to world capitalism, the imperialists now sought to secure ideologically their "right" of plundering them.

Imperialist propaganda maintained that the times of national independence were long over, that all peoples were "mutually connected" and could not, therefore, assure sufficient progress on their own, through use of national independence. It also peddled the idea that it was futile to establish national states and to exercise national sovereignty.

International imperialism dreaded the development of the newly-free peoples into national states, because, under the influence of the world socialist system and the international working-class movement, they were liable to opt for the socialist way. Walt Rostow, ideologue of US imperialism, said this danger to world capitalism was the most important item the West should always keep in the centre of attention. The West must show, Rostow said, that underdeveloped peoples can also make progress within the capitalist system, provided they withstand the blandishments of the Communists.

In their interpretation of the national question, Socialists and Social-Democrats usually follow the lead of the modern imperialist theoreticians and ideologues. True, their declarations and programmes of the 1940s and 1950s abounded in mellifluous phrases, and some even professed internationalism. But in effect social-reformism was the determinative element in their theoretical and political content; they renounced defence of national interests and espoused a chauvinist, frankly nationalist policy towards the colonial and dependent peoples.

The Right Socialists publicly defended monopoly capitalism along with Hans Kohn, Rupert Emerson, Richard Pipes, R. Strausz-Hupé, Walter Kolarz and other imperialist theorists specialising in the national question. The US Socialist Party's call to convert the United Nations into a "federal world government" was clearly influenced by the cosmopolitanism of US monopoly, and merely provided socialist camouflage for monopoly goals. The ideologues of the Right Socialists in France extolled Eurafrica, that is, an incongruous fusion of Europe's old monopoly capitalism with Africa's burgeoning young capitalism, in effect echoing the French monopolies' yearning for a "third force" to block both the influence of world socialism and the US imperialist plans of world supremacy.

The right of peoples to self-determination, inscribed in the UN Charter on Soviet initiative, was universally recognised under the influence of the national solution in the USSR and the pressure of world opinion. But the Right Socialists tried to distort this progressive idea. While the peoples understood its

substance correctly as the right to *political* secession and independent national statehood, the Right Social-Democrats argued that political freedom was "senseless" if economic independence was impossible. The leaders of Britain's Labour Party, the French Socialists, and many others went out of their way to promote this standpoint. The Right Socialist press also claimed that the nationalism of oppressed peoples was reactionary, that their separatism destroyed international ties, and that to form independent national states in the colonial zone meant ignoring the material condition of the working class in the metropolitan countries, and so on. Guy Mollet, the French social-reformist, advised peoples in the colonies and semi-colonies to "save" a stage in their development and shun independent national statehood. Instead, he enjoined them to enter into a "community" with the French nation. Another French Socialist Party theorist, Lucien Lauras, described full national independence (for colonial peoples, of course) as a "chimera and anachronism" in the epoch of a world market and universal economic ties.

The social reformists in Britain, France, Belgium, Holland and other countries used political oppression, economic pressure and colonial wars to keep the oppressed peoples from gaining national independence. And when the national liberation movement placed the matter on the order of the day, an attempt was made to reduce independence to the minimum: in some cases independence was accompanied by armed occupation, in others the former colonial power put its own man at the head of the state, or reduced independence to a mere internal autonomy, with the former colonial governor serving as the head of the local "government".

The Right Socialist press fell in step with imperialist reaction and, taking a purely cosmopolitan stand, extolled the "theory" of "limited sovereignty". In July 1951 the First Congress of the Socialist International declared that "absolute national sovereignty must be transcended".¹ The following year, the Italian Social-Democratic Party demanded in its action programme "a growing and constructive solidarity between

¹ *Yearbook of the International Socialist Labour Movement. 1956-1957.* London, 1956, p. 44.

the nations of the world willing to entrust a part of their national sovereignty to international or supra-national organisations".¹

Soon, the US Socialist Party demanded — in full accord with the aims of US monopoly — to "break down artificial economic barriers and promote ideals broader than national sovereignty".² And Guy Mollet declared at the 1957 congress of his party: "The concept of sovereignty must gradually disappear. The epoch of borders is over." It is useless, he continued, "to create nations and borders where they do not exist", because that meant "turning back the clock of history".

The theory of "limited sovereignty", backed up by the expansionist ambitions of monopoly capital in the major imperialist states, has done visible harm to national relations between oppressor and oppressed peoples. In effect, it was a cover-up for colonialism and neo-colonialism. Many of the Right Socialist parties in colonies and dependent countries, in fact, were reluctant to recognise it. Doubly so, because the social-reformists of some of the colonial powers combined it candidly with a vindication of colonialism. "Colonialism is a legitimate thing," the French Socialist Party said in a post-war document, though adding the following vague phrase: "If it is regarded as a joint undertaking of two peoples, as cooperation profitable to either." As though "cooperation", much less cooperation equally "profitable to either", is possible between colonialists and their victims.

It is not surprising, therefore, that a mere 18 months after the foundation of the Socialist International, there took place an Asian Socialist Conference of nine Right Socialist parties. The reason given for the separation was that "in their approach to the problem of colonialism and freedom for dependent peoples ... they differ considerably."³

Europe's Right Socialists helped the West European monopolies set up the Common Market. From the outset the EEC became deeply involved with the problem of national relations on four planes: a) between the peoples in the EEC; b)

¹ *Yearbook of the International Socialist Labour Movement, 1956-1957*, p. 329.

² *Ibid.*, p. 490.

³ *Socialist International Information*, Vol. V, No. 9, Feb. 26, 1955, p. 136.

between the EEC countries and the other developed capitalist states; c) between the EEC countries and the world socialist system; and d) between the EEC and the peoples in the colonies and dependent countries.

These aspects of national relations raised the question of the "nations' unity", for the apologists of monopoly capital advanced the idea of "national integration". What they were after was a consolidation of national community, which should ultimately eradicate class differences by eroding the class features of the bourgeoisie and "deproletarianising" the working class.

The establishment of the EEC, a restricted economic group, has, despite all talk and actual moves towards integration, considerably sharpened relations between nations. Competition increased steeply between the EEC countries and the other European states, seven of which formed an association with Britain. Inside the EEC, too, contradictions tended to increase. Especially between the West German and French monopolies, both of which wished to subordinate the community to their own aims. The existence of the EEC had the effect of quickly strengthening the positions of West German imperialism. French monopoly capital invoked nationalism in a bid to unite the French nation, fighting for supremacy in the Common Market and Europe generally, on the one hand, and directed its nationalism against the US monopolies' ambition to tighten their hold on the world and the ambition of the West German monopolies to get a firmer grip on Europe, on the other.

It would be a mistake, however, to think that all this concerned only the relations between monopolies of different countries. The ensuing competitive struggle affected the masses, principally the working class. Ever since the Marshall Plan times, when most West European countries came under the control of US imperialism, the working people had to face up to the challenge of defending the national independence of their countries. The founding of the EEC aggravated the problem still more, because the contradictions between the European capitalist countries grew sharper instead of blunter. What made matters worse was that the free flow of capital and manpower within the EEC was used by the bourgeoisie to split the workers along national lines into local and "immigrant".

Employers were able to pay the latter lower wages, making this a means of pressure on the national working class.

This deterioration of economic relations between the oppressor and oppressed peoples, between the developed capitalist countries, and between the latter and the newly-independent peoples, visibly stimulated the growth of national feelings and the national consciousness. This was unquestionably a natural and progressive thing, especially in the environment of liberation from colonial oppression. But the contradictions between the bourgeoisie of different countries also affected national relations between peoples. The monopolies of the metropolitan states, especially, had a stake in inciting hostility and hatred against the oppressed peoples.

The progressive growth of the national consciousness of colonial and dependent peoples encouraged the unification of all progressive forces, including segments of the propertied classes, in united anti-imperialist fronts against the colonialists. At no time in the history of the colonial system was the national liberation movement so vast and massive. It dealt simultaneously with the national and the social issues. True, the social objectives were only partial, amounting to efforts to ease foreign oppression, because even if the struggle for liberation was successful, it gave the oppressed peoples little or nothing beyond political independence. In the sense of national objectives, on the other hand, the result was considerably greater. First, the national liberation movement was able to reach the main objective, the natural objective of all national movements: formation of a national state. Second, there quickly developed a national community—a process in which the national consciousness of peoples and the national state resulting from the liberation struggle played a special role.

Only few peoples succeeded in throwing off the colonial yoke before the end of the second stage of the general crisis of capitalism. Twelve new nation-states were founded in the 1940s, and only eight in the 1950s. But there were several important sidelights. First, the victorious national liberation revolutions of the 1940s were confined to Asia only, whereas in the 1950s colonialism began to crumble in Africa as well, where liberation was won by the peoples of Libya, Sudan, Morocco, Tunisia, Ghana and Guinea. Second, colonial rule was by then

so weak that liberation in the final stage was achieved in some cases by a referendum, as in Guinea.

In Latin America the content of the national question was somewhat different. Here, too, the processes of national consolidation and the coming together of peoples were under way. But the problem of national independence from US monopoly held top priority. The liberation struggle of the Cuban, Guatemalan and Colombian peoples in the 1940s and 1950s, therefore, was, for all the importance of its social objectives, directed also against US imperialism. Yet the peculiarity of the situation in Latin America did affect the social composition of the liberation movement. The national bourgeoisie by and large abandoned the struggle, because many of the objectives of national liberation, particularly political independence and the formation of nation-states, were already attained. The dependence on US monopoly, on the other hand, was so great, and the class contradictions already so acute, that it never even entered the minds of the bourgeoisie to exploit its people by itself.

The role of nationalism, too, was far more obscure in Latin America. Where it did exist, it contained fewer democratic factors than its counterparts in Asia and Africa. This does not go to say that reactionary factors were totally absent in the Asian and African nationalisms. They existed, and often had a very negative effect on relations between peoples. The reactionary feudal gentry and the nascent bourgeoisie deliberately encouraged the reactionary aspects of nationalism and obstructed good-neighbour relations among peoples. Some sections of the Arab bourgeoisie, for example, made visible efforts to subjugate Arab peoples that had already opted for independent national development. Certain leaders in Africa succumbed to imperialist propaganda and tried to give nationalism an anti-communist complexion. Obviously influenced by imperialist ideologues, nationalism was portrayed as a roadblock to communist influence on the liberated peoples.

Attempts to nullify the influence of the socialist world on the national liberation movement were doomed to fail. The successes of the socialist community and the international working-class movement made an ever greater impact on the development of nations and national relations in the developed

capitalist countries and, to a still greater extent, in the young national states. The Soviet Union and the French working class, for example, played a tremendous part in the struggle for the freedom and independence of Vietnam and Algeria. It was not confined to moral support of the Vietnamese and Algerian peoples or moral condemnation of the colonial wars waged there by the French imperialists. World opinion was mobilised, political actions were taken, and there was substantial and steady material aid—supplies of arms, facilities for training, and the like.

Year after year, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries persistently demanded a complete and final end to colonialism. They demanded independence for all peoples, withdrawal of imperialist occupation troops from foreign territories, and interdiction of the colonialists' aggressive designs. The countries of the socialist community were invariably the first to extend to the liberated countries political recognition, economic aid, favourable trading terms, and help in defending their freedom and national independence. It was the Soviet Union's firm stand that frustrated international imperialism's aggression against Egypt and Syria in 1956. The importance of the part played by the world socialist system in the economic growth of the developing countries may be judged by the steadily growing trade between them. By the 1970s, the Soviet Union alone had extensive trade relations with 70 Asian, African and Latin American countries.

The aid which the world socialist system and the international working-class movement were always ready to extend was also of the utmost importance for the activity of progressive forces in Asia, Africa and Latin America, notably the Marxist-Leninist parties. Eighteen new parties came into being on the three continents in the second stage of the general crisis of capitalism. Their programmes and policy in the national question were based on Marxism-Leninism. The number of Communists grew considerably. In 1939, Asia (excluding the now socialist countries) had only 22,000 Communists, whereas in 1969 its non-socialist part had as many as 650,000. In Latin America, the figure grew from 90,000 to 340,000, and in Africa from 5,000 to 60,000.

The working class, too, grew in numbers. The workers gained political maturity and learned to define their national and international objectives. Latin America, for example, had 3,700,000 industrial workers and 10,800,000 farm labourers in 1950. The working class was the advance force of the working people in the capitalist world—a force that defended their true national and international interests, and, helped by the Marxist-Leninist parties, defined the way of promoting them.

* * *

That, in sum, is the substance of the national question in the bourgeois world. Those are the changes in the development of nations and national relations caused by the influence of the October Revolution, the building of socialism in the USSR, and the emergence of the world socialist system. Whereas imperialism aggravated national antagonisms to preserve the capitalist system, the socialist world found a source of strength and power, a source of rapid progress for the peoples in solving the national question.

II. THE SOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL QUESTION. DEVELOPMENT AND CONVERGENCE OF NATIONS UNDER SOCIALISM

Socialism, Lenin said, harbours tremendous power. It is a stage in history when humanity gains new and extraordinary possibilities for growth and development. This applies literally to all fields of society, and leads, among other things, to the solution of the national question, one of the most complicated in the life of mankind.

The founders of scientific communism, Marx and Engels, were quick to see that solution of the national question is basic for the sound and free development of nations. But this development based on truly fraternal national relations was inconceivable on the foundation left by the capitalist system as a legacy to socialism. Socialism had to create its own new basis. On destroying capitalism, Lenin said, the proletariat creates no more than the *possibility* of eliminating national oppression, but to eliminate it *in fact* it must build the foundation of the new system—socialist production, and full democracy in all spheres.¹

The influence of the socialist mode of production on the content of the national question is exercised less through the free development of the productive forces and essentially through the triumph of the new relations of production, the cooperation and mutual aid of all working men regardless of nationality. It stands to reason that in the early period of Soviet power the content of the national question—both the development of peoples and their mutual relations—was

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 325.

influenced by the fact that the socialist mode of production was only beginning to gain hold, the variety in modes of production was not yet eliminated, and social relations were not entirely socialist. But this was temporary. When socialism triumphed throughout the land national and international processes came under the full sway of the socialist mode of production. The same is true of the other socialist countries. Only in a few did (and does) the policy of regulating the correlation of the national and international suffer from subjectivist neglect of the demands of the socialist mode of production.

By resolving the national question socialism at once proved its superiority over capitalism. Abolishing national oppression and inequality, and assuring free development for its nations, nationalities and national and ethnic groups, the Soviet Union blazed unexplored trails to the flowering of all the peoples and their rapprochement through joint building of a classless society. Setting a common aim—the building of socialism and communism—Marxism-Leninism provides an ideological and practical basis for new fraternal relations, cooperation and mutual aid, among working people of all nationalities.

Bourgeois science, on the other hand, is unable to furnish any constructive guideline to the peoples. Political leaders in the USA admit that US society is “demoralised”. Approaching its final downfall, capitalism tends to sharpen national contradictions to a point not short of costly and sanguinary wars.

The more than 50 years of Lenin’s programme and the CPSU policy on the national question in the USSR, and successful national solutions in other countries of the socialist system in the past quarter of a century, permit us to trace the changes in the content of the development of nations and national relations in each of the stages of building a classless society. Proletarian internationalism, the basic element in the life, development and fraternal relations of all peoples following the socialist road is, and always was, the main and determining factor in the content of the national question. From the very outset socialism declared war on all possible forms of bourgeois nationalism, which has always been a brake on progress.

In the Soviet land, Lenin and the Communist Party laid special emphasis on combatting Russian great-power chauvinism, which presented the main danger to fraternal relations among the peoples. "I declare war to the death on dominant nation chauvinism",¹ Lenin wrote to a meeting of the Party's Central Committee. Another big danger in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries was local nationalism, and national exclusiveness in interpreting the common aims of all the peoples.

Following the victory of socialism, proletarian internationalism, and the successful elimination of bourgeois nationalism destroyed the social causes of the latter. It survives chiefly as a residue in the minds of a few individuals. Socialist internationalism has taken hold as the ideology and practice both of the individual peoples and of the family of fraternal peoples in multinational states and the socialist community as a whole.

National equality at home and in international policy has been one of the central aspects in the content of national relations under socialism or, more precisely, from the first day of the workers' power in all its forms. The Soviet land was the first in the world where, in the complicated tangle of relations between its many peoples, Lenin's words about working-class national policy were translated into practice. He said: "To the old world, the world of national oppression, national bickering, and national isolation the workers counterpose a new world, a world of the unity of the working people of all nations, a world in which there is no place for any privileges or for the slightest degree of oppression of man by man."²

But even after proletarian dictatorship triumphs, national equality remains a complicated problem. The first to be achieved is *legal and political equality*. This is proclaimed with the abolition of national oppression, and implemented in the course of the struggle for the victory of socialism. One of the main forms of national equality is the self-determination of peoples, their right to national statehood. Statehood is the guarantee that a people obtains the vitally necessary conditions for further development. It is wrong to think, Engels once said,

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 372.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 19, p. 92.

that from the international standpoint national independence is something secondary. On the contrary, he said, it is the basis for all international cooperation. This Marxist thesis has always been the foundation of the Leninist national policy of the CPSU, and of the fraternal Communist and Workers' parties in other socialist countries. The progress of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the world socialist system, their fraternal relations, show clearly that, as Engels observed, international cooperation is possible only among equals. This is why Lenin stressed that the Russian Federation should not occupy a place of privilege in the fraternal family of Soviet peoples. He said: "We consider ourselves, the Ukrainian SSR and others, equal, and enter with them, on an equal basis, into a new union, a new federation."¹

On Lenin's initiative national equality in political matters was complemented by the Party's constant promotion of the *factual equality* of peoples in economic and cultural development. Lenin spoke of this before the October Revolution, and in still clearer terms defined the necessity of assuring equality in deed and "aid to backward and weak nations"² in the draft Second Programme of the Party. In his later instructions to the Party on the national question, he again referred to eliminating factual inequality.³

For every multinational socialist country that incorporates underdeveloped and backward peoples, elimination of their factual inequality is obligatory. Important steps to assure the factual equality of peoples have also been taken in other socialist countries.

Factual inequality, which mainly concerned backward nationalities and tribes, was eliminated in the Soviet Union during the building of socialism, notably on the basis of Lenin's theory that backward peoples could by-pass capitalism and develop along a non-capitalist way. Marx and Engels had anticipated that this was possible once peoples backward due to colonisation would be able to go over to socialism by-passing capitalism, and sometimes directly from a primaeval communi-

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 42, pp. 421-22.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 29, p. 110.

³ See *ibid.*, Vol. 36, p. 608.

ty. Lenin developed this thought into a clear-cut system of theoretical propositions, and contributed significantly to its practical implementation.

First, national statehood was granted to peoples before they had attained the usual "degree" of national consolidation, economic development and political unity. Second, the building of national states and national consolidation on the periphery of the Soviet land proceeded in many cases under the guidance of the Russian working class, because the local national workers' contingents were either very weak, or still only incipient. Third, the population of national areas and the Russian working class were in many cases politically linked by Marxist-Leninist party organisations with a predominantly peasant membership. The organs of power were for a long time, in effect, not organs of proletarian dictatorship, but of a revolutionary-democratic nature. Fourth, national relations along the periphery, especially between the local population and the Russian people, began to change radically once Soviet power was established. A decisive contributing factor here was the joint struggle for Soviet power, and then also the readiness with which Soviet Russia implemented Lenin's instruction for the Russian people to assume the main burden of economic and cultural development and of training national cadres—which amounted to voluntarily assumed unequal cooperation.

Assuring national unity was an important objective for peoples following the non-capitalist way, and for all nations and nationalities. This meant more than just eliminating exploiting classes and strata. The viability and general progress of nations and nationalities depended largely on the unity of class interests and the spiritual image of the workers and peasants, on the closeness to them of the intelligentsia. The transformed social structure of nations and nationalities was basic for the national consolidation of peoples and for forming socialist-type nations and nationalities.

In the USSR and other socialist countries the transformation of nations and nationalities was based on the proletarian dictatorship, the socialist mode of production, and the consolidation of Marxism-Leninism as the ideology of working people of different nationalities. As to national processes, the

main elements of the formation of socialist nations and nationalities were: a) the transformation of nations and nationalities of the bourgeois society into nations and nationalities of the socialist type; b) the development of many nationalities that had formed in capitalist conditions directly into socialist nations; and c) the merging of different tribes and ethnic groups into nationalities of the socialist type.

The unity of the national and the international in the life of peoples under socialism is assured by the mode of production and the new social relations in general. The elimination of oppression and exploitation, the elimination of conditions in which one people could develop at the expense of another, the unity of aims and interests, tend to eliminate hostility and mistrust, and to promote national relations of friendship, close cooperation and fraternal mutual assistance.

The friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union forged by the Communist Party on the basis of Lenin's teaching, and at first under his personal direction, is one of socialism's greatest gains, an unprecedented success in solving the national question. Friendship is not simply an absence of mistrust or differences among peoples, but a new and exceedingly significant social factor in the development of a multinational country under socialism. The resolutions of CPSU congresses and the Party's Programme describe the friendship of the peoples of the USSR as one of the principal results of Lenin's national policy and one of the most powerful forces behind the growth of Soviet society. "The Soviet Union embodies relations of unity and friendship between free nations, previously unheard-of in history. This friendship is one of the greatest gains of socialism, a mighty motive force of Soviet society, and an inexhaustible fount for the creative endeavour of the working people of all the nationalities in the USSR, for the most noble cause—the construction of communism."¹

This friendship of the peoples reposes on the all-round cooperation and fraternal mutual assistance of the socialist nations, nationalities and ethnic groups, promoted and organised by the Party.

¹ *On Preparations for the 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Resolution of the CC CPSU*, p. 4.

The final victory of socialism in the USSR and its present successes in building communism gave strong impetus to the trend towards a) the flowering and coming together of nations, and b) the evening out of their economic and cultural levels.

Following the victory of the socialist revolution, the blind and spontaneous social forces governing the national and international processes under capitalism gave way to objective regularities that provide ever greater scope to the consciousness of the working people of different nationalities, and to the guidance of Marxist-Leninist parties. Naturally, this does not substitute for the objective laws. But it helps to apprehend these laws on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and to direct the development of nations and national relations accordingly.

The flowering and coming together of nations and nationalities is one of the most important and difficult factors to be taken into account as an objective and necessary aspect of the solution of the national question and the progress of national relations in general. It is important to bear in mind, too, that in many areas of society it is impossible to leap across still unpassed stages of the development of nations and national relations. For example, fraternity of peoples cannot be achieved before there is fraternity of workers of different nationalities, or international development before there is national development.

The programme and policy of the CPSU have, from the very outset, secured both the flowering and the convergence of every nation and nationality. The Party acted on Lenin's ideas concerning the world-wide law of socialism on the development of nations and national relations.¹

The flowering and the coming together of nations as the materialisation of the two tendencies of the worldwide law of socialism, occur simultaneously. Under the proletarian dictatorship the flowering of a people is impossible in isolation, without convergence with other peoples building socialism, or without internationalist unity with the working people of capitalist countries, just as the convergence of nations is inconceivable if the development and flowering of any one of them is impeded or restricted. In the present stage, the

¹ For the substance and manifestations of this law see Chapter I.

operation of the world-wide law of socialism is based on a dialectical unity of the national and international, with precedence of the latter.

To be sure, factual inequality cannot be overcome without solid international ties and friendship between the backward and advanced peoples, without a degree of convergence. Neither can it be overcome without a truly internationalist approach by the advanced nations towards the underdeveloped. For the advanced nations, as Engels said, the existence, autonomy and internal independence of underdeveloped peoples is part of the very concept of internationalism. Lenin, too, had this in mind in saying that those who did not understand that following the socialist revolution the bigger nation had to compensate the factual inequality of the smaller, previously oppressed peoples, did not understand the real proletarian attitude to the national question.¹ As for the backward peoples, for all the significance of the international factors in their development, they should not hasten to make a contribution to the common cause equal to that of other peoples the moment the revolution is performed, for this is practically impossible; first they must eliminate their backwardness and lay the foundation for later constructive activity jointly with the other peoples. It follows that under socialism as well the thesis of Marx, Engels and Lenin holds true, namely, that to be international, a people must first become national, and that to become truly national it must also be international.

The Marxist view that international cooperation can exist only among equals means that the maximum results from such cooperation are achieved only after factual inequality is overcome and the economic, political and cultural level has been raised to equal that of other peoples. This applies to multinational countries, and also to relations between countries of the world socialist system.

It was not until the previously backward peoples of the Soviet Union had overcome factual inequality that their international cooperation, friendship and convergence assured the emergence of a new historical, essentially international, community: the multinational Soviet people. A new interna-

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 36, p. 608.

tional community of people has also begun to take shape in the world socialist system. Its distinctive features, to judge from the example of the Soviet people, will be, firstly, a steady emergence and development of traits common to all the nations; secondly, a long survival of independent national communities, which will continue to exist up to the stage of mature communism, and, thirdly, the inevitably zonal character of international communities.

The successful solution of the national question and the formation of the Soviet people as a new historical community were of the utmost importance for the triumph of developed socialism in the USSR. The growth of developed socialism into communism signifies a new stage in the development of nations and national relations, in which, the CPSU Programme says, "the nations will draw still closer together until complete unity is achieved".¹

The steady drawing together of the nations and nationalities of the USSR, their greater unity and cohesion, are the guarantee of the Party's new successes in effectuating Lenin's national policy and in building communism. It is also one of the most important sources of the revolutionising influence of the Soviet Union on the development of mankind. "The Soviet Union today is regarded by the whole world as a country of communist construction, a fortress of the friendship of peoples, and the bulwark of the international revolutionary liberation movement."²

¹ *Road to Communism*, Moscow, 1962, p. 559.

² *On Preparations for the 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*. Resolution of the CC CPSU, pp. 22-23.

CHAPTER FOUR

NATIONS AND NATIONALITIES UNDER SOCIALISM

Proletarian revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat are the basic political preliminaries for the transformation of capitalist nations into socialist. It was the Great October Socialist Revolution that opened the way to the rapid economic, political and cultural uplift of the many nations and nationalities of Russia, and to their development into socialist nations. Some of them by-passed the capitalist stage.

Socialist nations "arise" and develop upon the foundation of existing nations and nationalities, retaining the ties of succession with all the progressive values accumulated by them over the centuries and rejecting the reactionary and outdated. Large ethnic groups, too, which had not earlier become nations, are also transformed into socialist nations.

The building of socialism changes radically the political and socio-economic conditions, and the cultural image, of nations and nationalities. New objective laws and regularities come into motion as these changes develop: the nations and nationalities thrive and draw together (these being two interlinked progressive tendencies); they achieve socialist national and international unity based on their progressive social homogeneity; all nations are drawn into the process of building communist society; complete political equality of peoples is exercised; socialist internationalism is faithfully observed; the national and international tasks of nations and nationalities are harmonised; cooperation and mutual aid are steadily broadened; economic and cultural levels balanced; and the like.

1. DETERMINING FACTORS IN THE SOCIALIST DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONS

The radical alteration of the class structure of Soviet society and the consequent triumph of friendly class and national relations reveal the intrinsic connection and unity between the socialist transformation of classes and social groups and that of nations and nationalities. As Lenin had predicted, it was a dual process: break-up of the system of exploitation, of the mode of private enterprise, on the one hand, and, on the other, their replacement with the foundation for the socio-economic, politico-ideological and internationalist unity of the people in the Soviet country as a whole.

Since property relations (ownership of the means of production) condition the integrity and unity of economic relations in a society, it is clear that their content and character help determine not only the socio-economic structure but also the character of relations between the classes, peoples and nations.

In a socialist revolution it is the abolition of private and its replacement with public ownership, the establishment of socialist relations of production and the development of a socialist economy, that provide the *economic foundation* for the free development of nations and nationalities, and for their gradual but steady convergence.

Accordingly, the two historically conditioned opposite types of property—private capitalist and public socialist—determine the two qualitatively different social types of nations and national relations. The capitalist relations of domination and oppression between people, classes and nations give way to new relations—relations of equality, friendship, cooperation and fraternal mutual assistance.

Lenin's programme for the socialist development of nations and national relations set the objective of eliminating the inequality between the peoples of the former Russian empire in the shortest possible time. The bourgeois and landlord system had left the nations and nationalities of Russia at very low levels of economic and cultural development. Besides, these levels differed, and had to be balanced on the basis of general all-round development, but with the more backward

II. SOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL QUESTION

nationalities growing at much faster rates. It was necessary to build an economy conforming with the new political system. This meant that the Communist Party and the Soviet government had to assure the growth of the socialist economy of all the nations and nationalities, and eliminate their economic inequality.

In former tsarist Russia some 25 million people were still nomad cattle-breeders or in a primitive tribal state. This should give us an idea of the monumental complexity of the task. The Northern peoples—the Nenets, Khanty, Mansi, Chukchi, and others—lived in clans and tribal groups and had not yet, in effect, even approached the feudal stage. Feudal relations prevailed among the peoples of the Northern Caucasus, and also among the Tajik, Kazakh, Kirghiz, Kara-kalpak, and other peoples. And it fell to the lot of the victorious Russian proletariat to assure the transition to socialism of these peoples, which had not yet reached, let alone passed, the capitalist stage.

From the beginning of the revolution, the Communist Party and the Soviet government took vigorous steps to develop the socialist economy of all nations and nationalities. The more developed peoples, especially the Russian people, rendered tremendous assistance to the economically and culturally backward nations and nationalities.

First of all, it was necessary to create industrial centres in the peripheral territories. The 10th Congress of the Communist Party stressed in its resolutions that “the cardinal task is to successively eliminate all remnants of national inequality in all social and economic spheres, and, first and foremost, assure planned development of industry in the peripheral areas through a transfer of factories to the sources of raw materials”.¹ Accordingly, the formerly oppressed peoples received tremendous and unrepayable aid. And as the economy grew, the mutual assistance of Soviet nations and nationalities increased proportionately. In the socialist environment the friendship of the peoples and their all-round cooperation were a law of development, society’s motive force and source of progress. Socialism furnishes the conditions for

¹ CPSU: *Resolutions of Congresses, Conferences, and CC Plenums*, Vol. 2, Moscow, 1970, p. 253 (in Russian).

the accelerated growth and flowering of all nations and nationalities, advanced as well as backward, with the latter developing at higher rates for otherwise the differing levels would never balance out.

Not only the formerly backward peripheral regions, but also the industrially developed parts of Russia, the Ukraine and some of the other republics changed beyond recognition. New towns and industrial centres went up rapidly in the national republics, territories and areas. A national cadre of skilled workers was trained. The collectivisation of agriculture assured economic development on a socialist basis. The economic backwardness and dispersed farming, a distinct cause for local and national narrow-mindedness, was thus promptly overcome. The abolition of the exploiting classes, the establishment of a single socialist-type economy, eliminated the basis for the former national hostility.

The gradual radical transformation of the social and economic conditions of the backward peoples coupled with the victory of the socialist economic system created a new type of relations among nations and nationalities. Assuring equality in relation to the means of production, public ownership liberated the working people from all forms of dependence and national oppression, producing a community of their political and economic interests.

The spread of socialist ownership put in motion a specifically socialist law of development: the economic, cultural and socio-political levelling of the nations. For the levels of all nations and nationalities to strike a balance, socialist relations of production must reign in all spheres of the economy, and the productivity of labour and living standards must be approximately the same.

The dictatorship of the proletariat, socialist democracy, Lenin showed, was the *political* basis for the socialist development of nations, new national relations, and the drawing together and friendship of the peoples.

He devoted considerable attention to the question of national statehood, and held that in Soviet conditions a multinational country like the former Russian empire could develop on a socialist basis as a free union of equal peoples possessing both national statehood and a union state. Drawing

on Lenin's theory of the development of nations and national relations, the Bolshevik Party lost no time after the October Revolution to tackle the construction of nation-states on the basis of the right of nations to self-determination. The October Revolution put an end to national oppression, proclaimed and assured the exercise of the right of self-determination. This right became a constitutional norm within the country and a foreign-policy principle of the Soviet state.

To offset the force of attraction of Lenin's national policy, bourgeois ideologues maintained that Communists conceive self-determination not as a right of the whole people, but of just the proletariat. In fact, this utter falsehood is still in circulation. At the 6th World Sociological Congress in Eviane (1966), for example, US sociologist V. Dadrian again alleged that Lenin had regarded self-determination as "a right exclusively of the working class". This is untrue. Even before the socialist revolution, Lenin dealt with the question of self-determination and the statehood of nations and nationalities in clear and precise terms, and criticised the "leftists" who reduced self-determination to a right exclusively of the working class, and who rejected the need for national state frontiers in a socialist Russia.¹

Following the socialist revolution, the Party argued in favour of self-determination as the surest means for eliminating the mistrust and alienation inherited from the capitalist period, and exposed bourgeois designs to use self-determination for its class ends, and against the revolution. Self-determination, as the Bolsheviks saw it, would facilitate the development and convergence of nations and nationalities on a basis of peace, democracy and socialism. The Party fought for the right to self-determination, and strove to make the peoples' urge for it conform with the class interests of the proletariat, the working people.

The implementation of the principles proclaimed by the October Revolution—those of equality and sovereignty, the right of nations to self-determination, repeal of national and national-religious privileges and restrictions, the free develop-

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, pp. 297-303; Vol. 29, pp. 170-175.

ment of national minorities and ethnic groups — paved the way to the voluntary amalgamation of free and equal nations and nationalities. In April, 1917, in a pamphlet entitled, *The Tasks of the Proletariat in our Revolution*, Lenin wrote: "The more democratic the Russian republic, and the more successfully it organises itself into a Republic of Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies, the more powerful will be the force of *voluntary* attraction to such a republic on the part of the working people of *all* nations."¹ This, the facts show, is perfectly true.

The experience of socialist construction confirmed that socialism alone creates the conditions necessary for consolidating national statehood on the basis of proletarian internationalism, and that, far from dividing, this brings nations and nationalities closer together.

The common aims of building socialism, coupled with external factors, necessitated the closest possible unity of the peoples that had established Soviet power. Lenin's plan of a federative state which brought the different nations and nationalities of the former tsarist Russia under one roof, assured this closeness.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, experience shows, provides for a truly harmonious blending of international unity and national sovereignty. The nations that founded the Soviet Union won equal rights. By self-determination, developing their national statehood, they became constituent or union republics rather than separate states. Amalgamation as Soviet republics insured them against violations of their sovereignty, made it more secure, and protected it from imperialist brigandage. The entire strength of the Union was their strength, their defence.

The ideologues of the capitalist world are naturally annoyed that "the Soviet Union is in fact the most highly integrated and centralised nation-state that has yet existed in the world".² For them the amalgamation and close alliance of the Soviet nations is not a victory of internationalism, but a "new kind of integral

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 73.

² Frederick C. Barghoorn, *Soviet Russian Nationalism*, N. Y., Oxford University Press, 1956, p. 4.

nationalism".¹ They would have been more content with a false, merely proclaimed, internationalism, for in that case the republics would, one by one, fall easy prey to monopoly capital. But the Soviet nations chose to avoid this disastrous path and consolidated the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the basis of democratic centralism.

The borders of the Union republics, and those of the autonomous republics, autonomous territories and national areas were drawn to fit in with the economic factors, the way of life, and the national make-up of their population. The national sovereignty of all peoples, big and small, is safeguarded by the Constitution and legislation of the USSR, as well as those of the individual Union republics. The national equality of the minorities that have no independent state entity, because they are small in numbers or scattered, is also protected.

Socialist statehood, that of the constituent nations and that of the Union, has also contributed tremendously to *cultural development*. A nation's successful socio-economic development requires an upswing of culture and technical knowledge, which, in turn, are spurred by rapid industrial growth and scientific and technological progress.

Like the socialist transformation of nations and like their further development, this is part of the general laws governing communist construction.

To cultivate the socialist ideology and internationalism, to remake people into active builders of the new life, it was essential to raise the cultural level of the masses. A sweeping cultural revolution, linked closely with the upbuilding of the socialist economy, eliminated illiteracy and produced a national intelligentsia. All peoples obtained broad access to enlightenment and culture. Art and literature flourished. Socialist culture began to grow in various national forms. New, socialist traits appeared in the national character, enriched more and more by international features. *Marxism-Leninism became the theoretical and ideological basis for the development of nations and national relations.*

Political equality and their economic and cultural advance-

¹ *Ibid.*

ment turned the Soviet nations and nationalities into essentially new, socialist nations. Such nationalities as the Kazakhs, Kirghiz, Turkmen, Chuvashes, Yakuts and a few others, and also dozens of the smaller peoples of the former Russian empire, were drawn from the outset into the socialist orbit of development and, by-passing the capitalist stage, were transformed with the help of the Russian working class into socialist nations and nationalities.

This was the first and most impressive practical confirmation of the Marxist-Leninist theory that peoples can by-pass capitalism on their road to socialism.

The transformation of the nations and nationalities of the former bourgeois-landlord Russia into socialist nations and nationalities is an event of world-wide historic significance. For the first time in history there emerged nations and nationalities of a new type, different in essence from the nations and nationalities of capitalist society.

2. THE FEATURES OF SOCIALIST NATIONS AND THEIR DEVELOPMENT TRENDS

After the antagonistic contradictions were eliminated, the nations in the Soviet Union began to acquire social homogeneity. The class duality of the national character and culture melted away. The leading force of the socialist nations, the Marxist-Leninist parties, promoted the spirit of proletarian, socialist internationalism. The relations between socialist nations became a new type of international relations.

The deep-going changes that occurred and are still taking place in the essence of nations and national relations, were examined in the CC CPSU resolution On the Preparation for the 50th Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"The heroic efforts of the Soviet people have been worthily crowned by the building of a developed socialist society in the USSR. Within this society:

"the all-Union economy—a mutually-related national-economic complex, incorporating the national economies of the republics and developing in keeping with a single state

plan, in the interests of the country as a whole and each republic separately, has achieved a high level of development;

"class and national antagonisms have been removed. Society as a whole, and every nation and nationality individually, have a uniform social structure, comprised of the working class, collective-farmers and working intelligentsia;

"the comprehensive development of Soviet socialist democracy has been ensured within the unbreakable unity of the Union statehood and the national statehood of Republics on the basis of principles of democratic centralism and socialist federalism;

"the necessary requisites have been created for the active participation of the working people of all nationalities in the development of science, technology and culture. The flourishing, interaction and mutual enrichment of the cultures of socialist nations and nationalities have become a natural development in the life of the Soviet people;

"the ideology of Marxism-Leninism, socialist internationalism and the friendship of the peoples has become firmly entrenched, and there is a far-reaching exchange of material and cultural values and of personnel.

"The mutual influence and the internationalisation of the entire mode of life of the peoples is increasing in a variety of forms. The working people of every Republic are a multinational collective, within which national characteristics are harmoniously combined with international, socialist, generally Soviet features and traditions".¹

This alters the essence of the nation; it can no longer be defined by analogy with a nation of capitalist society.

The *socialist nation* is a new social community of people grown out of a nation or nationality of capitalist society in the process of the abolition of capitalism and the victory of socialism. Though on a qualitatively new basis, it retains definite ethnic traits of the former national community, but its entire mode of political, socio-economic and cultural life has been transformed in line with socialist, internationalist principles.

¹ On Preparations for the 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Resolution of the CC CPSU, pp. 16-18.

While essentially retaining its ethnic properties, a nation changes its social type radically with the victory of socialism and becomes socialist in economic basis, class structure, political system and cultural identity. New properties appear in it, determined by its socialist and international life, which also affects the reshaping of the old properties.

For a nation of the bourgeois society economic community implies an objective economic linkage through the prevailing relations of production of different (even antagonistic) social classes and groups. For a socialist nation, however, the friendly classes and groups have a genuine economic community in the sense not only of production ties, but also of equality in their relation to the means of production and of identity of economic interests and aims.

The interdependence of the national economies of socialist nations and nationalities within one country stimulates the development of an international economic community.

Territorial community as a condition and property of a nation is also of a new quality. The socialist nations have their own territory with its historical boundaries, which, however, gradually lose their former significance implicit in the bourgeois concept of separate nations. Communication between nations is ever growing and taking various forms. This does not go to say that national territory loses all meaning: the life and activity of the nation unfolds within a definite territory, the population is by no means indifferent to this territory, and Communists, who have always respected national feelings, have invariably insisted that national territory, its frontiers, should be determined democratically.

But claims of self-professed descendants of an ethnic community to territory that this community had inhabited in only the remote past and that is now the home of another nation, which formed there through many centuries, are unjustified and untenable.

While capitalism spurns the will of the people in marking boundaries, Lenin stressed, socialism demarcates borders "in accordance with the sympathies of the population". Of course, these borders depend on the national composition of the area in question. But with the building of socialism and communism, as economic contacts between socialist nations and

nationalities intensify, migration also grows, and people of different nationalities intermingle. This is why Lenin predicted that economic interests will be prevailing in the territorial distribution of the population. "The national composition of the population," he wrote, "is *one* of the very important economic factors, *but not the sole and not the most important factor....* That is why Marxists must not take their stand entirely and exclusively on the 'national-territorial' principle."¹

New building projects and development of virgin lands involves large masses of people of all nationalities. Communist building tends to mingle nationalities in all parts of the USSR. This is an unquestionably progressive factor. Contrived measures to preserve national homogeneity in a republic would only slow up the economic and social development of the peoples.

Some national peculiarities, like differences in socio-economic and cultural levels, are smoothed relatively quickly, especially under socialism. But such national peculiarities as ethnic differences, notably language forms, survive much longer.

The national forms of culture, too, are not immutable. They gradually align themselves with their socialist content, contributing to the development of socialist nations as a whole. In this quality, the national form does not become obsolete, and will play a useful part for a long time to come.

The national consciousness of socialist nations and nationalities changes radically, too. It reflects patriotic, progressive and, first and foremost, revolutionary traditions. Since deep loyalty to the socialist system, to communism, is the core of patriotism in the socialist society, it is clear that socialist national consciousness is substantially determined by the new type of economic, political and cultural ties both within each nation, and between them. The national consciousness of socialist nations is under the growing influence of the Marxist-Leninist, internationalist ideology.

"Sovietologists" R. Pipes and A. Benningsen, though they acknowledge the cultural advancement of all Soviet nations, still hope that the spectacular growth of the national intel-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 50.

ligentsia in the formerly backward periphery of Russia will generate nationalism and national isolation. Spotting a few chance examples of parochialism in some national republic, or chance violations of Leninist principles in selection of personnel, these men contend, as M. Corn does in *Libre Belgique* on March 29, 1967, that "local nationalism has not died in the USSR". But they are like the traveller who, on seeing three ginger-headed brothers in a Glasgow street, wrote in his diary: "This city is inhabited by redheads."

The progress of the national cultures of the Soviet peoples naturally heightens their interest in their history, the special qualities of their art and literature, etc. But in the socialist environment this is part of the socialist content of the national consciousness, with the specifically national and the international making up a unity and bearing a distinct imprint of the new social system.

Under socialism the patriotic consciousness acquires new features. Among Soviet people, too, the native landscape and its reflection in art arouses warm emotions and nationally coloured sentiments. But patriotism is not only affection for the native landscape, the native tongue and culture. The substance of patriotism, and Lenin showed this, is rooted in the individual's social involvement, his ideological and aesthetic attitude to the past and to the surrounding reality of today. But the main element in the content of patriotism is struggle for the progressive social system. Socialism has given birth to a new patriotism free from national limitations, signifying boundless dedication not only to the fatherland, but also, and most of all, to the socialist system, the socialist state, to communism.

Socialist patriotism is powered by the progressive traditions of the peoples of the socialist community. It treats the national and international as a unity. This is why it does not divide, but, on the contrary, unites nations and nationalities.

In the socialist environment the national character of people changes, absorbing the progressive elements of their nation's history. It takes shape in the process of building socialism and communism. It is wrong to consider as national only those features that distinguish one nation from another. Such features in the character of Soviet nations as socialist internationalism, mutual friendship and assistance, and Soviet

patriotism, are a reflection of the new, socialist relations. They are moulded by the socialist socio-economic and socio-political system, by its Marxist-Leninist ideology. Cumulatively, these features go into the making of the Soviet character, which is a unity of the national and international.

National relations are part of the socialist social relations and undergo substantial changes as the building of communism progresses. Socialist changes in the economic, social, political and cultural life of the Soviet peoples assured the victory of socialism. In the mature socialist society, nations and nationalities and their relations develop on a more solid socialist basis. The present-day national problems of the Soviet Union are quite different from those of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, let alone from the national question as it exists in capitalist society.

The stage of developed socialism, growing over into communism, is highlighted in the field of national relations by a more intensive operation of two progressive inter-connected tendencies: a continuous flowering of nations and nationalities and their convergence, greater mutual influence and mutual enrichment.

Conditions encouraging and facilitating the drawing together of nations, their mutual enrichment with progressive traditions and cultural achievements, overcoming backward national traditions, and the like, do not arise by themselves. Yet in their absence no other problems of the multinational state can be solved successfully. Once this view of the current tasks in the domain of national relations is properly understood, the magnitude of the work done by the Communist Party and the Soviet government for the further development of nations and national relations in the USSR, will certainly be fully appreciated.

But the interdependence and convergence of nations—even though theoretically acknowledged—does not preclude a one-sided approach by some people to the development of their own nation. These people regard convergence of nations as a passive and automatic result of the development of all the national elements. They are blind to the fact that the socialist development of the national must include internationalisation of economy, politics and ideology, the shaping of international

features in the culture and the spiritual make-up of all Soviet nations. The convergence and fraternal cooperation of nations is a crucial factor of their development, while their flowering adds impulse to this convergence. People prone to national egoism and exclusiveness are liable to regard all conscious activity to provide optimum conditions for the convergence of nations as a deliberate prodding towards the fusion of nations. Yet, facilitating an objective process and by-passing its necessary stages, are two different things.

It is quite unnecessary to provide any artificial impetus to what is stimulated by the very nature of socialist life. "At the same time," Leonid Brezhnev said, "the Party considers as impermissible any attempt to hold the convergence of nations up, to impede it on some pretext, or to give undue emphasis to national distinctiveness, because this would go against the general line of development of our society, the internationalist ideals and the ideology of Communists, the interests of communist construction."¹

The convergence of nations in the period of developed socialism is a natural historical process directed by the Party and the Soviet state. The CPSU Programme has outlined the further uplift of socialist nations, setting the sights on their convergence in all spheres of life, and on fraternal cooperation in line with the principles of socialist internationalism. This requires a harmonious combination of republican and all-Union interests, which, in turn, necessitates strictly scientific guidance of all social, including national, processes in the country.

3. INTERNATIONALISM—THE IDEOLOGICAL BASIS FOR THE SOCIALIST DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONS

The transformation of nations of capitalist society into socialist nations and the emergence of socialist relations between peoples are tied in with the struggle of proletarian, socialist internationalism against bourgeois nationalism.

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, pp. 36-37.

The capitalist mode of production, which gave rise to nationalism, also gave rise to its antipode—proletarian internationalism. Marxism-Leninism has pinpointed the objective reasons for the convergence of peoples, and showed that proletarian internationalism is traceable to the socio-economic condition of the proletariat and represents one of the key factors of the emancipation of working people and the building by them of communist society.

Representing the international solidarity of workers, manifested in their psychology, ideology, politics and social practice, proletarian internationalism is, in socialist conditions, the foundation for the convergence and flowering of all nations and nationalities, and an effective factor in the building of socialism and communism. As a political principle and a principle of communist ethics, proletarian internationalism is an organic part of Marxism-Leninism. There can be no such thing as Marxist-Leninist theory and practice without consistent internationalism. To be fighters against capitalism, to be builders of socialism and communism once capitalism is overthrown, the working people must be internationalists. The blend of socialist patriotism and internationalism is an important factor and indicator of the individual's moral development. Acceptance of internationalism as a conviction, as part of the individual's mentality and behaviour, is essential for his all-round harmonious development. Internationalism is the fundamental basis for the activity of Marxist-Leninist parties in promoting the communist outlook of people of different nations, promoting their unity, cohesion, and convergence.

Ideologues of the capitalist world oppose internationalism. They stop at nothing to distort the national consciousness of the peoples, seeking to substitute struggle between nations for class struggle under the flag of national unity. And opportunists are their helpers and allies. Divorcing national from class consciousness (and in the socialist environment, from socialist consciousness), "Left" and Right opportunists portray national unity as a supra-class value, and prevent working people from seeing their national interests in the socialist context—in close association with internationalism.

Lenin identified opportunism with nationalism. He stressed that "an adherent of internationalism who is not at the same time a most consistent and determined adversary of opportunism is a phantom, nothing more".¹

The underlying sense of internationalism is that every Marxist-Leninist party, especially if in power, must be conscious of its responsibility for the movement as a whole. Devising "specific", purely "national", roads to socialism and denying the common laws of socialist construction may jeopardise the cause of internationalism and socialism.

It is in the interests of all nations to combat nationalism. National sovereignty is the right of nations to arrange their socio-economic and socio-political life in their best interests. And the main interest of socialist nations is to assure the optimum conditions for the advance to communism.

Marxists-Leninists are said to have devised the so-called theory of limited sovereignty. Trying to show that proletarian internationalism ostensibly precludes national sovereignty, capitalist ideologues grossly distort the facts. The all-round cooperation among socialist countries does not limit national sovereignty. On the contrary, it assures the fullest possible exercise of sovereignty.

Nationalism, and its extreme variety, chauvinism, on the other hand, continuously threaten the socialist gains, the interests of nations. Isolation of a people or enslavement of another people are in the interest of just the exploiting classes. Abolition of these classes and socialist construction destroy the social roots of nationalism. Yet, for a number of reasons it continues to surface in various forms for a long time. This should not be ascribed to the national forms of life *per se* or the allegedly inborn nationalistic psychology of people, as anti-communists would have us believe. It is due wholly and entirely to historical conditions. It is, among other things, due to the painful legacy of past hostility and suspicion and the lag of the consciousness from socialist being, and, especially, to the assiduous efforts of imperialists and their ideologues to rekindle and fan nationalist prejudice, exaggerated or distorted national feelings. Partly, it is also due to inadvertent

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 156.

distortions of socialist principles: violations of the equality of peoples in economic or cultural development, neglect of the achievements and contributions of a nation to the development of society, neglect of national feelings, and the like.

What does the most harm are violations of the policy of personnel selection, when it is forgotten that all people living in a republic, regardless of their nationality, are bearers of its statehood and builders of its economy and national culture.

If socialist patriotism is replaced by narrow national pseudo-patriotism, if patriotism comes out of the control of the socialist consciousness and turns into national narrowness, it becomes a virulent medium of nationalism.

Frequently, nationalist tendencies are disguised. For example, they may take the form of concern for the flowering of the nation, for its peculiar qualities, traditions and customs. Once people fall under the spell of this nationalism, they become blind to the demarcation line between socialist patriotism and bourgeois nationalism. In such cases, indiscriminate praise of the national past is paraded as Soviet patriotism, though socialist patriotism is known to accept only the progressive elements in the history of the nations.

People infected with nationalism display national arrogance instead of national pride. They ascribe their nation's successes to its special gifts. Its failures are blamed on excessive closeness to other nations and nationalities. Overemphasis of the "individuality" of national histories and cultures, allegedly free from the influence of other cultures, is a sign of national narrowness. Such interpretations of national individuality impede sound relations and the mutual enrichment of nations and nationalities.

Lenin called attention to national distinctions. Correct and purposeful policy, he said, prevented national factors from acquiring "an isolating" significance, and, conversely, developed and strengthened the internationalist ties between people of different nations. He did not nihilistically deny national distinctions. He only opposed nationalistic interpretations and gave priority to the internationalist principle in the education of working people.

National distinctions must be taken into account, but in such a way as to direct nations and national relations along the right

course. It is essential to combat attempts to make an absolute, a fundamental principle, of national distinctions, attempts to ascribe the virtues of a nation to its specific attributes, its allegedly special nature as distinct from the nature of other nations.

While taking note of national distinctions, Marxist-Leninist parties oppose and help eliminate outdated reactionary traditions, encourage the progressive traditions, and also promote the mutual enrichment of all nations with old and new values. Despite everything the imperialists and nationalists are doing to the contrary, the peoples of the socialist countries are learning from experience that bourgeois nationalism and national egoism go against their true national interests. They work actively for closer ties, convergence and fraternal cooperation.

The Marxist-Leninist parties of the socialist countries play the decisive role in organising economic, political and cultural cooperation. Communists are aware that the growing community of peoples benefits from the development of socialism and reposes on the resolution of the non-antagonistic contradictions of the socialist world system. This is an important factor in the drawing together of nations and the consolidation of the world socialist system on the basis of socialist internationalism.

Lenin warned that national feelings must be treated with care. He warned that "different nations are advancing in the same historical direction, but by very different zigzags and paths".¹ But he also warned that in all cases the Communist "must fight *against* small-nation narrow-mindedness, seclusion and isolation, consider the whole and the general, subordinate the particular to the general interest".² Marxists-Leninists analyse the different situations in order to provide a favourable background for the convergence of nations, to anticipate, diagnose and resolve contradictions that may arise.

All-round cooperation of the peoples with the strictest observance of Marxist-Leninist principles and of socialist

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 195.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 22, p. 347.

internationalism, is the surest way to bring nations closer together and consolidate the multinational socialist community of people.

The Marxist-Leninist parties of the socialist countries are focusing their efforts on the maximum use of the historic law of the all-round development and convergence of nations, and strive to make the most of all the opportunities implicit in international socialist cooperation and mutual assistance, in socialist internationalism.

**ECONOMIC FACTORS UNDERLYING
THE DEVELOPMENT AND CONVERGENCE
OF SOCIALIST NATIONS AND NATIONALITIES**

The approach to defining and regulating the economic factors underlying the development and convergence of nations and nationalities under socialism occupies a central place in the Marxist-Leninist teaching on nations and national relations. The essence of these economic factors derives, first and foremost, from the socialist relations of production and their connection with all spheres of social relations, including national and international processes.

Relations of production determine relations between nations. They are, therefore, the foundation on which cooperation and mutual assistance among socialist nations and nationalities arise, function and develop. They influence all aspects of the life of society—the social, political, ideological, cultural, the way of life, traditions, and the like. In many ways, they not only shape the spiritual image of nations and nationalities, but also the nature of the relations between them.

The influence of socialist relations of production on the life and mutual relations of the peoples of the USSR is reflected in the development of the multinational Soviet state as a single economic complex. The Soviet economy is international in nature, significance and development, being the material basis of the life of the Soviet people as a new historical community. Since the economies of all the republics of the Soviet Union form a single whole, the country was able rapidly to overcome the appalling legacy of past centuries, perform deep-going socio-economic transformations in the interest of the working people of all nations and nationalities, build a developed socialist society and launch communist construction.

1. ECONOMIC COOPERATION AMONG NATIONS BUILDING THE MATERIAL AND TECHNICAL BASIS OF SOCIALISM

The productive forces of pre-revolutionary Russia were very unevenly distributed. Industry was concentrated mainly in the European part of the country, and there was practically none in the eastern and south-eastern areas. The industrial Centre, the mining South and the Petersburg and Baltic economic areas accounted for 67.2 per cent of the manufacturing and mining industries (excluding the Polish gubernias). Meanwhile, the vast Siberian territory accounted for only 2.2 per cent of industrial output, and Turkestan's share was still smaller — 1.7 per cent.

Tsarism pursued a colonialist policy, deliberately discouraging industrial development in most of the national regions. The backward peoples who had not gone through the capitalist stage by the time socialist construction began, had no developed social division of labour, no large industry, and no experience of industrial labour. Their economic ties with the more developed peoples amounted mainly to non-equivalent exchange of raw materials for manufactured goods.

Following the establishment of Soviet power, the initial goal in resolving the national question was to eliminate the economic backwardness of different peoples. The only way to accomplish this was to replace the old with the new relations of production, to raise the level of the productive forces, and alter the class structure.

Public ownership of the means of production offered the opportunity of placing all the peoples in the country on an equal economic footing. However, many nations and especially the backward nationalities lacked the material resources to benefit from this. Their political and legal equality, assured by the October Revolution, had to be complemented with real economic equality. Overcoming backwardness and achieving factual equality was, therefore, a single process embracing all spheres of the life of these peoples.

Soon after the October Revolution the Communist Party and the Soviet Government set out to eliminate the factual inequality of nations. In doing so, they followed Lenin's

instructions to assure "a close economic alliance"¹ between the Soviet republics, because otherwise it was impossible to assure the well-being of the working people. To eliminate factual inequality, to overcome the backwardness of formerly oppressed peoples, it was necessary, firstly, to secure the economic progress of society as a whole, and, secondly, to assure the assistance of the more developed nations.

The resolution of the 12th Party Congress stressed that many backward peoples "are unable without real and long-term assistance from outside fully to use their rights and opportunities ... to rise to a higher level of development and catch up with ... nationalities that have outstripped them".² This is understandable. To catch up with the advanced nations, the backward had to develop at a much higher rate.

The Communist Party worked out measures whereby the socialist state concentrated all material assets in its own hands and redistributed them among the republics. This made it possible to transfer some of the resources of the more developed republics to meet the economic and cultural needs of the less developed.

In May 1918, Lenin signed a decree allocating 50 million rubles to Turkestan for irrigating the Hungry Steppe.

In December 1921, the government of the Russian Federation met Byelorussia's request and financed its requirements in the next economic year, and also gave it raw materials and equipment. Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia were provided 11 million rubles in gold in 1921-1922 to buy tractors, restore the irrigation scheme, finance cotton-growing, and build the Zemo-Avchal hydropower project. In 1921, the Russian Federation surrendered to Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia more than 3.5 million poods of grain, and in 1921-1922 the Turkestan Republic received 4.5 million poods of grain for its cotton-growing regions and, in addition, the peasants were provided farm implements, food, etc.

Even before the Civil War had ended Soviet Russia, ravaged by war and itself starving, sent considerable sums to the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 147.

² CPSU: *Resolutions of Congresses, Conferences, and CC Plenums*, Vol. 2, p. 438 (in Russian).

railwaymen of Kharkov and the miners of the Donets Basin, and rendered substantial economic aid to Byelorussia, Lithuania and Latvia.

The Russian and other nations aided the backward peoples in other forms as well. Enterprises in the industrial areas (the Centre, the Ukraine, the Urals, and so on) manufactured machines and equipment for factories in Central Asia, Transcaucasia, etc. In 1921-1922, many trainloads of manufactured goods were sent to the south and east from cities in the Russian Federation, along with engineers and technicians, skilled workers, scientists, teachers and lecturers, and cultural workers. New enterprises were built in the national areas, and industrial and office workers, and intellectuals were trained from among the local population.

That all the Soviet peoples had national personnel of their own even before the war is evidenced by the rising percentage of workers of the local nationality. In 1937, for example, they comprised 69.5 per cent of industrial workers in Byelorussia, 36.5 in Tataria, about 33 in Mordovia, 30 in Kirghizia, 30 in Daghestan, and 10 in Yakutia. In the Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic their number in local industries grew 7.7-fold from 1926 to 1939, and in the Central Asian republics, where no local workers had existed before the revolution, they accounted for more than one-quarter of all workers by 1939, and in the Ukraine, Byelorussia and Armenia for more than two-thirds.

The growth of national detachments of the working class of the Soviet Union impelled the further flowering and convergence of nations, and also the development of internationalist features among working people of different nationalities. Russian workers were the vanguard in the industrial development of republics and regions, and in training national working-class detachments.

Helping what were known as the national peripheries became part of the overall economic policy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. "Suffice it to say," Leonid Brezhnev recalls, "that for many years the budget expenditures of a number of Union republics were covered mainly by subsidies from the all-Union budget. For instance, in 1924 and 1925 the share of the revenues in the budget of the Turkmen Republic

covered by that Republic itself came to just over 10 per cent. Even a large Republic such as the Ukraine at that time covered under 40 per cent of its budget expenditures with its own resources."¹

The Communist Party and the Soviet state aided the backward peoples throughout the period of building the new society. The volume and forms of aid naturally depended on the state of the material-technical basis of the burgeoning socialism. It helped the republics to perform deep-going social and economic transformations in the interest of the working peoples of all the nations and nationalities of the country.

The selfless assistance rendered to the backward peoples by the Russian and other nations did not rule out reciprocal assistance, which was also provided in many different forms—raw materials for industry, food for the people of the country's central regions, and the like.

Economic cooperation grew in step with the advance to factual equality. The new relations of production gave the nations and nationalities a common stake in boosting production across the country as the basis for raising the living standard of all working people. This cooperation and mutual assistance was expressive of the objective need for development, for expanding the society's productive forces, for building a socialist economy. This cooperation among nations and nationalities is a natural law of history in the period of socialist and communist construction.

Cooperation among the peoples was accompanied by struggle against various nationalist political-ideological currents. The bourgeois nationalists, for example, had "theories" which in substance endeavoured to "prove" the necessity for separate, isolated national existence. They wanted to retard, and perhaps ultimately frustrate, socialist construction in the country's national areas. Taking cover behind calls to preserve the national identity, they tried to perpetuate the old economic structures and exploited the mistrust instilled against Russians by the old tsarist anti-people's policy still surviving among part of the population, chiefly the backward peasants.

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, pp. 20-21.

The concern shown for the needs of the nations and nationalities by the Communist Party and the Soviet state, their sincere efforts to help overcome backwardness, generated internationalist unity.

The assistance of the more developed nations was geared to the requirements of the backward peoples and the country as a whole. The resolution of the 15th Party Congress stressed that "special attention should be given to raising the economy and culture of the backward national areas and backward regions, because it is necessary gradually to eliminate their economic and cultural backwardness, and accordingly provide for a more rapid rate of growth of their economy and culture in order to coordinate the needs and requirements of these areas with the needs and requirements of the Union".¹ The economic potential of the Soviet Union increased steadily from one stage of socialist construction to the next, thereby helping the formerly oppressed peoples to overcome backwardness.

Industrialisation and the collectivisation of agriculture helped to close the gap between the economic levels of the republics, invigorated the alliance of workers and collective farmers within each nation and nationality and in the Soviet Union as a whole, and assured steady economic and cultural growth. The division of labour under which some peoples developed as industrial peoples and others as agrarian, was terminated.

The economic policy of the Communist Party during the years of socialist construction was an embodiment of Lenin's precept. "Only large-scale, planned construction, which aims at evenly utilising economic and business values, deserves to be called socialist,"² he said in 1918. Directed by the Communist Party's policy and the single economic plan, the participation of all the Soviet nations and nationalities in building the material and technical basis of socialism reinforced the singleness of their economic development and stimulated the drawing together of the peoples. Socialist construction under a large-scale general plan was the objective precondition for levelling out the economic development of the republics.

¹ CPSU: *Resolutions of Congresses, Conferences, CC Plenums*, Vol. 4, Moscow, 1970, p. 45 (in Russian).

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 36.

Fascist Germany's attack on the Soviet Union slowed up this process. During the Great Patriotic War, the nazi invaders inflicted tremendous material damage on the economy. Out of the total war loss of 679,000 million rubles (in 1941 prices) the damage sustained by the Russian Federation was 255,000 million, the Ukraine 285,000 million, Byelorussia 75,000 million, Latvia 20,000 million, Lithuania 17,000 million, Estonia 16,000 million, and Moldavia 11,000 million rubles. But "no statistics," as L. I. Brezhnev said, "can give the real picture of the actual scale of the damage suffered by the Soviet people in the war. It is impossible to calculate and state in figures the tremendous work, thought and talent that many generations of our people had put into creating the vast material and spiritual values destroyed by the fascists."¹

The war-ravaged economy had to be raised from its ruins. It was necessary to restore industry and agriculture to their prewar level, and there had to be rapid economic and cultural progress. Time would not wait. And the Party and people were determined to waste no time. In 1946, the USSR Supreme Soviet passed the Law on the Five-Year Plan of Economic Rehabilitation and Development for 1946-1950, which earmarked more than 46 per cent of all investments for repairing the war damage done to the economy.

The Soviet peoples marshalled their strength and resources to aid the war-ravaged areas, with many republics and territories assuming what was called patronage over specific regions. Kazakhstan, for instance, assumed patronage over the Ukraine and the Stalingrad and Orel regions. Azerbaijan was the patron of Stavropol Territory, and Udmurtia—of Byelorussia, etc.

Industrial enterprises in Moscow, Leningrad, Gorky, Sverdlovsk, Chelyabinsk, Karaganda, Tula, Yaroslavl and other cities helped to restart the Donetsk Basin coal mines. Enterprises in Moscow, Leningrad, Kuibyshev, Magnitogorsk, Tashkent and elsewhere filled orders for the Dnieper Hydropower Station.

In 1944, that is, before the war was over, the Soviet government allocated 429 million rubles, over a thousand

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1970, Vol. 1, p. 140 (in Russian).

machine tools, much metal, a large number of various machines, and quantities of building material, for the rehabilitation of Byelorussia. Byelorussia's farmers were supplied 13,000 horses, 80,000 cattle, and 130,000 sheep. An additional 920 million rubles, or 40 per cent more than during all the prewar industrialisation, were put into the Byelorussian economy between 1944 and 1950.

Huge funds were allocated to the war-ravaged economies of the autonomous republics of the Russian Federation. Over 326 million rubles was pumped into the industry and transport of Northern Ossetia in 1946-1948, and more than 148 million into the economy of Kabardino-Balkaria in 1943-1948.

The economy of the Baltic republics—Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia—was restored with active assistance from all the peoples of the Soviet Union. Moscow and Leningrad provided industrial equipment—machines and tools; the Urals provided pig iron, steel, and piping; the cities of Baku and Grozny supplied oil and oil products; Gorky supplied automobiles, and the Central Asian republics delivered cotton, etc. In 1946 alone, Latvia received more new automobiles than had been available in bourgeois Latvia before the war. Lithuania was supplied 75,000 tons of metal, 78,000 tons of cement, 850,000 tons of coal and many other goods (between 1946 and 1949). Not counting supplies received from other sources, Estonia was sent over 250-million-ruble worth of materials, primary goods and equipment through the Estonsnabsbyt supply agency alone.

The inflow of goods to the war-ravaged republics was substantially greater than the outflow. This speeded their rehabilitation. Manufactured goods shipped out of Estonia to other republics in 1945, for example, amounted to only 7 per cent of its total output, valued at 16,200,000 rubles, while the value of what was shipped in was ten times this figure.

It was thanks to the fraternal assistance of other republics and regions that the economies of the republics that had suffered nazi occupation were restored by the end of the 1940s, and that towards the end of the 1950s considerable advances were registered in balancing out the levels of the economic development of all the republics. In 1958 the gross industrial output of the Soviet Union was 330 per cent higher

than in 1940. The same figure for Kazakhstan was 467 per cent, Lithuania—nearly 700, Moldavia 655, Latvia 770, Kirghizia 410, Armenia 530, and Estonia 826. In the Ukraine industrial output had grown 202 per cent in the same period, Byelorussia 237, Georgia 240, Azerbaijan 145, etc.

The Party's orientation on the priority development of heavy industry in the fourth, fifth and sixth five-year plan periods was of paramount significance for economic rehabilitation and the balancing of economic levels. Between 1913 and 1958, gross industrial output grew 36 times that of 1913, while the output of the means of production increased 83 times and engineering and metalworking 240 times during the same period. Significant advances were also made in agriculture, largely through the development of long-fallow and virgin lands. "Only the pooling of all the forces and resources of the country enabled the Soviet people within the briefest historical period to do away with economic and cultural backwardness—the legacy of tsarism and capitalism ... to build socialism and turn the USSR into a powerful, well-developed country, and to start the construction of a communist society."¹ As a result of the Leninist nationalities policy, "the term of 'backward national outlying area', a usual one for old Russia, has disappeared.... This is a splendid achievement for our Party, an achievement of socialism, of the socialist friendship of nations".²

2. FURTHER CONSOLIDATION OF ECONOMIC TIES BETWEEN NATIONS AND NATIONALITIES IN DEVELOPED SOCIALIST SOCIETY

The building of communism opened a new stage in economic relations between socialist nations and nationalities, and powered their further convergence. The significance and extent of their cooperation and mutual assistance increased greatly. The internationalisation of society became more intensive.

¹ *On Preparations for the 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*. Resolution of the CC CPSU, p. 14.

² L. I. Brezhnev, *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, p. 24.

The rapid growth and improvement of the productive forces, the vast scale of construction, and the steadily rising rate of scientific and technological progress required a further expansion of cooperation and mutual assistance between the Soviet republics. The material and technical basis of communism is being built jointly, by the coordinated effort of all the socialist nations and nationalities.

The cooperation of the republics in all economic fields had a tremendous effect on the development of each. Compared with 1922, the year when the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was founded, industrial output in 1972 had grown more than 600-fold in Kazakhstan, 532-fold in Moldavia, 527-fold in Armenia, 513-fold in Tajikistan, 412-fold in Kirghizia, 343-fold in Byelorussia, 308-fold in the Russian Federation, 239-fold in Uzbekistan, 176-fold in the Ukraine, 161-fold in Georgia, 136-fold in Turkmenia and 67-fold in Azerbaijan. Industrial output in Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia went up 31-37 fold in the period since 1940.

Cooperation and mutual assistance between the republics is provided for in Soviet national economic plans. The Tenth Five-Year Plan, for example, envisages an industrial output growth of 35-39 per cent for the Soviet Union as a whole, while specifying 37-41 per cent growth for Azerbaijan, 39-43 for Byelorussia and Kazakhstan, 38-42 for Tajikistan, 43-47 for Armenia and 45-49 per cent for Moldavia.¹ "Today, when the task of levelling up the economic development of the various republics has been in the main completed," said Leonid Brezhnev at the joint meeting of the CC CPSU, the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation on December 21, 1972, "we have the possibility of approaching economic problems principally from the standpoint of the interests of the state as a whole, from the standpoint of raising the efficacy of the entire national economy of the USSR, with consideration, needless to say, for the specific interests of the Union and Autonomous Republics."²

¹ See *Guidelines for the Development of the National Economy of the USSR for 1976-1980*, Moscow, 1976, pp. 97-105.

² L. I. Brezhnev, *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, p. 77.

The nations and nationalities of the USSR owe their rapid all-round economic, social, political and cultural progress to the advantages of socialism. Socialism provides conditions for the fullest possible planning and rational distribution of the productive forces on the scale of the entire country, and for their use in the interests of the people irrespective of race or nationality. "Only a society which makes it possible for its productive forces to dovetail harmoniously into each other on the basis of one single vast plan," wrote Frederick Engels, "can allow industry to be distributed over the whole country in the way best adapted to its own development, and to the maintenance and development of the other elements of production."¹

The leading role of the working class in the development and convergence of nations and nationalities becomes much more distinct in the socialist environment. It derives from the workers' place in society as a class forming the vanguard of the builders of communism. The efforts of the working class, whose percentage in the population of all the republics is increasing continuously, assure the successful construction of communism's material and technical basis. This is why it is the Party's policy to promote the leading role of the working class in communist construction, to enhance its political influence on all the other social strata.

Expressing and defending the interests of the working people of each nation and nationality, the Communist Party is mindful of the identity of interests of the Union and of its constituent republics. Directing the development of the country as a whole, it bears in mind the specific features of the economy and the production experience of the population in each republic, while avoiding exaggeration of its national peculiarities. That is the only policy that can facilitate growth of the economic potential of the entire country, as well as of each Soviet republic. The forms and methods of combining all-Union and republican interests are continuously revised and improved.

Both the all-Union and republican interests require that the general interest should take precedence in practical matters,

¹ Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 351.

such, for instance, as rational distribution of the productive forces. The economic aspect is considered first: whether or not it is in the interests of the entire country to build a project in a given region. Profitability is one factor but there are others: the project's usefulness for the development of the nation or nationality in question, for tightening the bonds between nations, for providing jobs in a particular area, for the country's defensive capability, and the like. In other words, both the republican and all-Union interests are considered.

In the conditions of communist construction the many republics of the Soviet Union have equal access to the achievements of scientific and technological progress, even though some of them are more agricultural than industrial. All industries, along with agriculture, whatever republic they are in, make up the single Soviet economy. Through cooperation, inter-republican specialisation and collaboration in production, each republic can develop its economy at a high rate and achieve a state of general prosperity. At present, in fact, given the single economic complex on the scale of the whole country, the successes of republics, regions and districts constitute the common, joint successes of the economy of the single federative state.

The Programme of the Soviet Communist Party, the documents of its 24th and 25th Congresses, single out as prime objectives a further improvement of the distribution of the productive forces, development of natural wealth and perfection of the socialist division of labour among the republics. The natural resources of Siberia and the Soviet Far East are slated for rapid development. To improve the location of the productive forces, the Economic Guidelines for 1976-1980 adopted by the 25th CPSU Congress, envisage "a further build-up of the economic potential of the eastern regions, increasing their role in the all-Union production of industrial goods" and "further economic growth in all the Union and Autonomous Republics and economic regions, Autonomous Regions and National Areas."¹

¹ *Guidelines for the Development of the National Economy of the USSR for 1976-1980*, pp. 89, 90.

The tightening of economic bonds between the Soviet republics during all the stages of the development of our society was predicted by the objective economic laws of socialism. These laws (heightening of labour productivity, planned and proportional development, and others) operate simultaneously in the economy of the country as a whole and in that of each separate republic. However, it should be borne in mind that their operation in the republics is strongly influenced by historical, natural, geographical and other features: availability of resources, area, population, the worker-to-peasant ratio in the social structure, and the like.

Long-standing production ties between republics, specialisation, and social division of labour have a strong bearing on the functioning of the economic laws of socialism. They must therefore be seen through the prism of the distinctions peculiar to the historical and economic development of the republics. The law of priority production of the means of production, for example, does not signify that production of capital goods sets priority in every republic. In some of the republics priority goes to the food and light industries. This depends on the social division of labour, on the needs of specialisation and cooperation in production.

Through specialisation, branches of industry necessary for the entire country are concentrated in republics and areas with the most suitable conditions, and are thus more easily advanced and improved. The economic process of the country is thereby directed to a more economical and effective production of goods.

Cooperation in production fuses the economies of the republics into a single whole. It creates close economic ties between nations and nationalities, impels internationalisation of the economy, and consolidates the economic community of the Soviet nations. In the absence of cooperation, society would not have been able to take full advantage of the natural and historical conditions of the republics for the production of material values.

In sum, specialisation and cooperation in production are two interconnected and interdependent aspects of a single process.

Specialisation is not an obstacle to all-round economic development. On the contrary, it presupposes many-sided

growth. Under the Eighth Five-Year Plan, for example, different industries were developed in each Union republic (depending on its concrete conditions). Estonia, for example, which has no metallurgical industry of its own but possesses highly-skilled technical personnel, has built electromechanical, radio-technical and instrument-building enterprises. They are labour-intensive and require a high degree of skill. Kirghizia, known for its cattle-breeding and its light and food industries, developed power engineering, machine-building, the non-ferrous metals industry, and building materials industry. Tajikistan laid the foundations for a chemical industry and launched cement production. One more example: apart from its light and food industries, Turkmenia has built oil, gas, and chemical enterprises. In its Directives for the Ninth Five-Year Plan, the 24th Congress of the CPSU said: "A further improvement of the location of the productive forces shall be achieved and territorial economic ties shall be enhanced. The Union republics and the local Soviets of Working People's Deputies shall be given a bigger role in deciding the location of the productive forces.

"The rational combination of sectoral and territorial planning shall be ensured."¹

The principle of distribution according to quantity and quality of work, which underlies the living standard of working people of all the Soviet nations and nationalities, is highly important for the relations between the constituent republics. In line with this principle, the Soviet state—a state of the whole people—redistributes the national income in order to resolve cardinal all-Union and republican problems as a unity.

The Communist Party assures progress in all the republics. Among the measures it takes to this end are dissimilar republican plans, setting higher development rates for some Union republics than for others, a varying volume of investment into the economy of each and a redistribution of revenue from the turnover tax, along with additional allocations to republics whose industrial growth is to be more considerable. The 1976 Budget, for example, envisages the

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 296.

following republican allotments from all-Union taxes and revenue collected in the Union republics: 41.9 per cent of the turnover tax revenue to the Russian Federation, 44.1 to Latvia, 46.2 to the Ukraine, 57.3 to Estonia, 60 to Moldavia, 63.1 to Byelorussia, 67.7 to Azerbaijan, 84.1 to Georgia, 84.3 to Armenia, 90.1 to Tajikistan, 91.7 to Uzbekistan, 94.5 to Kirghizia, 98 to Lithuania and 100 per cent to Kazakhstan and Turkmenia.

In addition as much as 197,100,000 rubles are transferred from the all-Union budget to Kazakhstan and 65,200,000 rubles to the budget of Turkmenia to finance projects envisaged in the USSR Economic Development Plan for 1976. Redistribution of national incomes among the republics helps (in line with their needs) to improve the mechanisms and channels through which the republics contribute to the all-Union budget: allotments from the profit of enterprises, funds payment, the turnover tax, and the like.

Economic relations between nations benefit visibly from combining centralised management of industries with the extensive prerogatives of the Union republics. The recent economic reform, which extended the rights of the republican economic administrations, has not decentralised the country's economy. The more extensive rights of the republics do not conflict with the system of centralised economic management, for to build communism there must be state planning on the scale of the entire country. "Communism," Lenin wrote, "requires and presupposes the greatest possible centralisation of large-scale production throughout the country."¹

The greater independence and initiative allowed to the republican economic administrations, coupled with improved management, is tied in with the development of Soviet democracy, promotion of the creative efforts of working people, and their greater participation in resolving the country's crucial economic problems. This stimulates the growth rates of social production, the basis for the growth and continuous improvement of economic ties between the Soviet republics.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 96.

3. THE ECONOMIC FOUNDATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND CONVERGENCE OF NATIONS WITHIN THE WORLD SOCIALIST COMMUNITY

The socialist principles of cooperation among nations and nationalities followed in the Soviet Union, are also followed in the other socialist countries.

The similarity of the social and economic foundations of the socialist countries does not mean they have no distinctions. The distinctiveness of the concrete historical condition of peoples derives from the degree of socialisation of the means of production, the existence of several modes of production in towns and villages, the specific class structure of society, national and historical traditions, and the like.

Prominent among the reasons for the different features of economic development from one socialist country to another is the legacy of capitalism: disproportions, nonuniform development of different industries, disparities in the economic structure, dissimilar roles in the international division of labour, etc. This is why the similar social and economic foundations, which rule out antagonistic contradictions, do not mean absence of differences in economic relations. Every state pursues its own needs in its economic relations with other socialist countries, and has its own approach to concrete economic questions.

But internationalisation of economic life is gaining pace within the socialist community, spurred by objective economic factors and necessitating coordination of efforts in organising production on an international scale. Naturally, internationalisation of production in the framework of the world socialist system creates certain problems, due to the existence of national states. But these problems are resolved through coordination and balancing of the national economic plans.

The vital interests of the socialist nations require cooperation and mutual assistance, provided their sovereignty is not impinged upon and they retain the right to resolve questions of home and foreign policy independently. "Under socialism, the development of national economy, culture and statehood goes hand in hand with the strengthening and development of the

entire world socialist system, and with an ever greater consolidation of the unity of nations. The interests of the socialist system as a whole and national interests are harmoniously combined."¹ The validity of this Marxist-Leninist proposition is borne out by history.

The socialist countries are at a stage where they can use the potentialities and advantages of the new social system with considerably greater effect. The preconditions are being created for decisive victories in the contest against capitalism. Much has been accomplished in recent years.

The socialist countries are increasingly prominent in the world economy. The socialist community has become the world's most dynamic economic power. In 1971-1975 the industry of its member-countries grew four times as rapidly as that of the developed capitalist states. In 1975 their industrial output was more than double that of the Common Market countries. In the socialist countries, industries decisive for scientific and technological progress, such as the power and engineering industries, are being developed at particularly high rates.

Rational distribution of the productive forces, international division of labour, and realistic accommodation of the resources of each of the countries, provide scope for the historical advantages implicit in the socialist economic system. Making the most of these advantages, the member-countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) decide what country is best suited for the development of a specific industrial or agricultural branch. The German Democratic Republic, for example, specialises in machine tools, equipment for the chemical industry, and the like. In Rumania, the emphasis is on the oil and gas industry, and on petrochemicals. For Poland, it is shipbuilding, coal-mining, and manufacture of vehicles. Czechoslovakia has built up the production of presses, automatic and semi-automatic machine tools, electric-powered locomotives, etc.

International division of labour enables each socialist country to select for itself the most rational pattern of

¹ *The Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism*, Moscow, 1963, p. 50.

economic development, concentrate its efforts in the most effective areas of social production, and work for the highest possible productivity of labour. The CMEA Comprehensive Programme for the Further Extension and Improvement of Cooperation and the Development of Socialist Economic Integration envisages economic and organisational measures to draw large numbers of workers, technicians and engineers of different countries into international cooperation. Stimulating economic and social progress in the CMEA countries, integration is paving the way for a harmonious and deliberate drawing together of their peoples. Actually, it has opened a *new* stage in the economic relations between the states of the world socialist community.

The 27th CMEA Session (1973) drew the conclusion that implementation of the Comprehensive Programme has become the substance of the cooperation of its members. It outlined practical ways of speeding up and deepening the integrational process. Among other things, large joint scientific and technological amalgamations are planned for collaboration in manufacturing equipment for atomic power stations, development of up-to-date computers, and the like.

Further convergence of the countries of the socialist community is facilitated by the gradual balancing of their economic levels. This levelling out was defined by the 1960 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties as a "gradual elimination ... of historical differences in the levels of economic development".¹ In this sense, it may be viewed as an approximation of the share of industrial production in the aggregate output of the respective national economies, balancing the growth of per capita production, size of national income, the standard of living, the percentage of working class and urban population, etc. "The socialist system," says the Programme of the CPSU, "makes possible the abolition of the disparities in the economic and cultural development of countries inherited from capitalism, the more rapid development of the countries whose economy lagged behind under capitalism, the steady promotion of their economies and

¹ *Ibid.* p. 49.

cultures with the purpose of evening up the general level of development of the countries of the socialist community.”¹

Levelling in the framework of the socialist community eliminates economic inequality among socialist nations and nationalities, bringing about factual equality. In other words, it facilitates perfection of their mutual relations. Socialism paves the way for equal and mutually beneficial cooperation between working people of large and small nations in the world system.

The 27th CMEA Session recommended still greater emphasis on problems related to the balancing of the economic levels of the socialist countries. And impressive successes have been achieved. In the formative stage of the world socialist system, the European socialist countries were either industrial-agrarian or agrarian-industrial or totally agrarian, with the last two groups predominating. Now, the bulk of the national income is derived from industry in all the European CMEA countries. And there is a further approximation of living standards.

Their ruling Marxist-Leninist parties concentrate their efforts on making the cooperation among socialist states still more effective, on securing better solutions for problems facing each country and the community as a whole. For this purpose, and also to further multilateral economic cooperation, the International Investment Bank of the socialist countries was set up several years ago as an international credit agency of a new type, quite different from its capitalist counterparts in aims, terms of credit, and also in forms and methods of management. It helps to accelerate socialist economic integration, promotes more effective division of labour, specialisation and cooperation in production, and thereby more rapid progress in each of the fraternal countries and the community as a whole.

Deepening and improving the ties between the national economies is necessary to enhance further the social-political unity and friendship of the socialist peoples. By virtue of their economic integration, the cooperation of socialist countries is yielding new successes with the growth of the productive forces

¹ *The Road to Communism*, p. 580.

and the improvement of socialist relations of production in each country.

The economic integration of socialist countries is dealt with in the documents of the 25th Congress of the CPSU and those of the latest congresses and CC plenums of fraternal parties. Integration makes for more advanced methods of cooperation and offers broader scope for interaction in speeding up the development of the fraternal countries. "The further extension and improvement of cooperation and the development of socialist economic integration help to enhance the might of the socialist world system, strengthen the economy of every country, and are important factors for consolidating the socialist world system's unity and superiority over capitalism in all spheres of social life, and of ensuring its victory in the competition between socialism and capitalism."¹

¹ *Comprehensive Programme for the Further Extension and Improvement of Co-operation and Development of Socialist Economic Integration by the CMEA Member-Countries*, Moscow, 1971, p. 14.

CHAPTER SIX

THE NATIONAL STATE UNDER SOCIALISM

It was clear to Lenin and the Communist Party that following the proletarian revolution in the former Russian empire socialism would be best served by a large democratically centralised multinational state. History has confirmed this: the victory of socialism in the Soviet country is intimately linked with the formation and development of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. On the 50th Anniversary of the Union, the Party and people paid due homage to its initiator and organiser—Lenin. The CPSU Central Committee pointed out: *“The greatest credit for the creation of the multinational socialist state belongs to Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, the leader of the Party and the people.”*¹

The Union was formed following extensive theoretical research and political work by the Communist Party. It was a product of the revolutionary initiative of all the Soviet peoples rallied round the Russian people under the leadership of the heroic working class.

The experience of the more-than-50-year development of the Soviet multinational state is the Soviet Communist Party's creative contribution to the Marxist-Leninist teaching on nations and national relations, to the progress of the peoples all over the world. *“The formation and successful development of the USSR is of tremendous international importance, a major landmark in the social progress of entire mankind. Soviet experience in*

¹ On Preparations for the 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Resolution of the CC CPSU, p. 4.

creating a multinational socialist state, in building through the common effort of our peoples a developed socialist society and coping with the most complex national question, has won world recognition, and gives invaluable assistance to all fighters for social and national liberation."¹

It was the Marxist-Leninist tenets on the advantages of a large multinational state as compared with the possible fragmentation of Russia into separate smaller states that lay at the basis of the Party's policy from the time of its foundation. Even under the old system, the big state facilitated the creation of a united international front of working people of all nationalities under the leadership of the working class, which brought nearer the overthrow of capitalist and landowner rule. And it was doubly right to have large states under socialism, for economic factors require the quickest possible convergence and fusion of all nations in a classless society. The formerly oppressed peoples themselves, Lenin pointed out, will not want to secede chiefly for economic reasons, and will want alliance with the more advanced nations.

The advantage of large socialist states is that they can a) resolve questions of economic progress much more successfully than smaller ones; b) assure the full victory of the proletarian revolution; c) satisfy the interests of the working masses in the material and cultural domains; d) more distinctly show the great advantages of socialism over capitalism.

The Party was aware of the advantages of large states because, according to Lenin's teaching, the socialist revolution in the imperialist period could triumph for a start in just one or several, and not necessarily the most developed, states. In these circumstances, a large proletarian state had a better chance of surviving in the hostile capitalist encirclement, and showing all oppressed and exploited the superiority of the new, socialist system over the old, capitalist.

Even before the October Revolution, Lenin had a clear view of the main principles underlying the formation of a large multinational socialist state: democratic centralism, equality and free will in the relations of large and small peoples. These guidelines were invaluable for the Party in uniting the working

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.

people of all nationalities and initiating the development of national states after the victory of the proletarian revolution.

Lenin's tenet that a Republic of Soviets rather than a democratic parliamentary republic should replace the tsarist structures in Russia was of paramount significance for the evolution of the multinational state on the socialist basis. The concentration of all power in the Soviets, which had the closest bonds with the labouring masses irrespective of nationality, assured the democratic centralism of the state structures.

In the Soviet Republic, Lenin's principles of equality, free will and democratic centralism permitted the use of various forms of national statehood and federative alliance which, being Soviet in form and socialist in content, assured unity of the working people of all nationalities in the fight against the exploiting classes and for socialism.

In August and September 1917, shortly before the October Revolution, Lenin thought about what would best secure the broadest and truest freedom for the oppressed peoples of Russia's periphery: their own statehood and union on a federative basis, or incorporation in a multinational state with extensive local self-government?¹

He made a special study of the new content of national relations after the victory of the socialist revolution and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. Both the more rapid development of national and international processes within each people, and the opportunities for directing them in the new historical phase were his points of departure.

Since the socialist revolution had triumphed for a start in just one country, Lenin and the Party had to secure the support of other peoples. At the end of December 1917, Lenin made the following note: "How to 'win over' to the side of the Russian Socialist Republic of Soviets other nations, in general, and the nations formerly oppressed by the Great Russians, in particular?"² No longer was this a question of abolishing national oppression, for its foundations were already destroyed by the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship and the first steps towards the socialist mode of production.

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 448.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 36, pp. 460-61.

More important, and certainly no less difficult, was to shape national relations that would serve as the basis for a united front of the working people of all nationalities against the capitalist yoke and for building the new life. The answer to Lenin's question may be found in his later works. We learn from them that the actual course of events suggested the following main trends in shaping the new national relations:

a) joint struggle to establish and defend the dictatorship of the proletariat; in this struggle the working people of all nationalities become aware that irrespective of how the question of state independence and state frontiers is resolved, the main thing is a close military and economic alliance to combat common enemies;

b) the right of formerly oppressed peoples to form national states; recognition of their independence. This created mutual confidence and assured the equality of all peoples of the Soviet country, and served as a basis of its policy toward other peoples on the international scene. Lenin wrote: "It is by recognising the independence of the Polish, Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian and Finnish states that we are slowly but steadily winning the confidence of the labouring masses of the neighbouring small states, who were more backward and more deceived and downtrodden by the capitalists";¹

c) the maximum possible satisfaction of the interests of all nations, the greatest tact and concern for the national feelings of the peoples. "Our experience has left us with the firm conviction that only exclusive attention to the interests of various nations," Lenin wrote, "can remove grounds for conflicts, can remove mutual mistrust, can remove the fear of any intrigues and create that confidence, especially on the part of workers and peasants speaking different languages, without which there absolutely cannot be peaceful relations between peoples or anything like a successful development of everything that is of value in present-day civilisation";²

d) consideration for the former condition of the working people of the oppressor and oppressed nations when shaping new national relations. Lenin stressed that "the fundamental

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 30, p. 294.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 33, p. 386.

interest of proletarian solidarity, and consequently of the proletarian class struggle, requires that we never adopt a formal attitude to the national question, but always take into account the specific attitude of the proletarian of the oppressed (or small) nation towards the oppressor (or great) nation".¹

1. LENIN'S LEADERSHIP IN THE NATIONAL STATE QUESTION

The Communist Party advocated the right of nations to self-determination from the day it was founded. "The self-determination of nations," Lenin said, "means the political separation of these nations from alien national bodies, and the formation of an independent national state."² But at first the question concerned only the *right* of the peoples to national statehood. The Party's views on the matter of *exercising* this right took a long time to crystallise.

Advocating a united centralised state in Russia following the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship, the Communist Party did not raise the question of national statehood for peoples in the outlands until the social developments there put the issue on the order of the day. This did not mean that the Party's view of national statehood was negative. Restoration of the national statehood of the Polish and Finnish peoples, which had possessed it a short time before, was accepted as a probability. The same in the case of the Ukraine.³ But prior to the overthrow of tsarism and the new upsurge of the national liberation movement national statehood for the oppressed peoples of Russia was no more than a *possibility*. Developments had not reached a point where the matter demanded action.

In old Russia the right of nations to self-determination, Lenin noted, "cannot be accomplished without a successful *socialist* revolution".⁴ The socialist revolution could succeed only through united revolutionary action by the working people of all nationalities under the leadership of the Russian

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 36, p. 609.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 20, p. 397.

³ See *ibid.*, p. 413.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. 21, p. 292.

proletariat. Mutual confidence was required as the basis for such unity. It was chiefly this, in fact, that motivated the demand for the right to self-determination not short of secession and formation of independent national states. The Bolsheviks' main task in the national question, Lenin pointed out, was continuous propaganda "against all state and national privileges, and for the right, the equal right of all nations, to their national state".¹ This and only this would give the masses truly democratic and truly socialist ideas and assure an equal alliance of working people of different nations.

"It is impossible," Lenin said, "to estimate beforehand all the possible relations between the bourgeois liberation movements of the oppressed nations and the proletarian emancipation movement of the oppressor nation (the very problem which today makes the national question in Russia so difficult)." ² When the relation changed in favour of the working people during the October Revolution, the Communist Party did not hesitate to proclaim as entirely *appropriate* the formation of Soviet national states by all formerly oppressed peoples. Though the nationalist bourgeoisie in the national outlands tried to take advantage of this, in most cases it could do little more than complicate matters, and was unable to prevent the national, as well as social, liberation of formerly oppressed peoples.

After the October Revolution the place in society of the national question became much clearer. It also became clearer how to use the content and form of national statehood, of different state alliances of peoples, to promote their revival and prosperity, to advance the building of socialism. This was when the Party reached the conclusion that Soviet national statehood did not conflict with democratic centralism, and that, on the contrary, it benefited unity and could be used by the peoples to assure revival, prosperity, and progress towards a classless society.

The national self-awareness of the masses in the outlands grew swiftly. But the idea of national statehood did not arise

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 20, p. 414.

² *Ibid.*, p. 440.

overnight. Under the direction of the Bolshevik Party, the workers and peasants there, hand in hand with the Russian proletariat, worked diligently for a social revolution, and rightly assumed that once it was won it would secure the solution of the national question as well. In face of imminent revolution, ideologues of nationalism looked frantically for ways of safeguarding the power of capitalists and landowners. They tried to distract the masses from a socialist revolution with the slogan of a "common national" state. As for the working people, they gave no thought to the idea of national statehood until the socialist revolution broke out, and associated it with the victory of the revolution. It began to ripen among the workers and peasants, and in the Bolshevik organisations of the national areas, in proportion to the growing certainty of social liberation.

For a long time, while efforts were centred on building a united centralised state based on the victorious revolution, the Party was by and large opposed to federation. Apart from the special importance of the workers' international unity within the framework of a large state, Lenin stressed that under capitalism federation caused decentralisation and thus retarded progress in general. "We are certainly in favour of democratic centralism. We are opposed to *federation*,"¹ he wrote to S. Shahumyan² at the end of 1913, and amplified: "We are opposed to federation in principle, it loosens economic ties, and is unsuitable for a single state."³ Soon thereafter Lenin pointed out that as long and as far as different nations comprised one state, Marxists would on no account advocate the federative principle or decentralisation. Towards the end of 1914 in *On the National Pride of the Great Russians*, he repeated: "*Other conditions* being equal, we are decidedly for centralisation and are opposed to the petty-bourgeois ideal of federal relationships."⁴

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 500.

² Shahumyan, Stepan Grigorievich (1878-1918)—prominent figure in the Communist Party and the Soviet State, after the October Revolution he was Chairman of the Baku Council of People's Commissars. In 1918 he was shot with 25 other Baku commissars by the British interventionists.

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 500.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. 21, p. 105.

But Lenin's opposition to federation was never absolute. In 1903, he wrote: "We must always and unreservedly work for the *very closest* unity of the proletariat of all nationalities, and it is only in isolated and exceptional cases that we can advance and actively support demands conducive to the establishment of a new class state or to the substitution of a looser federal unity, etc., for the complete political unity of a state."¹ Here the reference was specifically to the conditions in Russia. In a number of cases, however, Lenin favoured federation also for other peoples (particularly in the Balkans, and also for Ireland and Britain). Describing Marx's attitude, who, though "an enemy of federalism in principle", considered it appropriate for Ireland and Britain, Lenin called attention to the fact that Marx had made a reservation: "...if *only* the emancipation of Ireland was achieved in a revolutionary, not reformist way".²

The change in Lenin's attitude to the question of national statehood affected the entire concept of national relations, including the problem of federation. It should be borne in mind here that with the obvious approach of the socialist revolution, he shifted the emphasis in matters of national relations to the period following the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

After the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution, the Party defined the democratic essence of building a multinational state. This was necessitated by the swift growth of the national liberation movement of the formerly oppressed peoples. At the April 1917 Party Conference, Lenin came to grips with many prominent Party leaders, who had not yet understood that the place of the national question in the country's life had changed. He stressed that the formation of sovereign national states was entirely acceptable. "We are for fraternal union of all nations," he said. "If there is a Ukrainian republic and a Russian republic, there will be closer contact and greater trust between the two."³ In the beginning of May 1917, he said that a *federative* state was perfectly suited for Russia. He stressed this in three separate references in his

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 6, p. 454.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 20, p. 441.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 24, p. 301.

"Instruction to Deputies to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies Elected in Factories and Regiments". What he had in mind was that Russians should allow "all other nations without exception freely to decide whether they wish to live as a separate state, or in union with whomsoever they please".¹ At the First All-Russia Congress of Soviets he described as forward-looking the decision of the Peasant Congress (moved by the Socialist-Revolutionaries), which advocated a voluntary federative republic of the peoples of Russia. Speaking at the Congress of Soviets, he referred to a "united and indivisible republic of Russia", and also to "separate" republics. By republic of Russia he evidently meant a federative state, for he also said, "Let Russia be a union of free republics."² In his book, *The State and Revolution*, he declared in so many words that federation was an acceptable means of resolving the national question in Russia.

After the October Revolution, bourgeois national states sprang up in some of the national territories—at first in Poland and Finland, and somewhat later in Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. In the Ukraine, the bourgeois-nationalist counter-revolutionaries, who had a considerable influence among the petty-bourgeois groups for some time following the victory of the October Revolution in the central regions of the country, played around for almost two months with the idea of forming a "general federative" government of a bourgeois-landowner Russia.

In most cases, the working masses in the national areas had the final say, thus frustrating the counter-revolutionary plans. As Lenin had predicted, the masses in the national territories sought alliance with the Russian proletariat. "Wide sections of the people of the oppressed nations (i. e., including the mass of the petty bourgeoisie)," he wrote on the eve of the October Revolution, "trust the proletariat of Russia more than they do the bourgeoisie."³

True, we must not overlook the centrifugal forces, which were fairly considerable at the time of the preparation for and

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 355.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 25, p. 37.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 26, p. 98.

the outbreak of the socialist revolution. Apart from the separatist tendencies among the bourgeois-nationalist counter-revolutionaries in the peripheral areas, there was also the alienating influence of the chauvinist policy first of the tsarist regime and then of the bourgeois Provisional Government. The economic ties of the centre with the periphery were badly disrupted. This created the danger of disintegration. Dreading the socialist revolution, the bourgeoisie in the national areas advanced plans of secession from Russia. But only in a few cases was it able to carry them out, despite support from foreign imperialists and, after the October Revolution, also partly from the Russian bourgeoisie.

Once the socialist revolution had triumphed, exercise of the right to self-determination became decisive for the national liberation of formerly oppressed peoples. The content and sense of this slogan, Lenin said, should be sought not in legal definitions or abstract formulas, but in the *historical-economic* conditions of the national movements. Two factors suggested the revision of the Party's standpoint concerning the immediate formation of national states: a) the country stood on the threshold of a socialist revolution which would inevitably involve the periphery, as well as the centre; b) the national liberation movement had attained so high a degree of maturity, had become so extensive, that the creation by the peoples of their own Soviet national statehood was an imminent prospect. Both these factors were connected, complemented each other, and thus necessitated a new approach to the question of national states.

Those were the reasons why the Party accepted federation as the structural principle of the Soviet multinational state.

Lenin's statements during the preparation for and in the course of the October Revolution make it safe to assume that what he meant by a federation at that time was a union state, for he had earlier said that "federation means the association of equals, an association that demands *common* agreement".¹ Autonomy was regarded as a form of regional self-government, rather than the embodiment of the national statehood of peoples. This is confirmed by the formation of the

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 19, p. 500.

Western and Moscow regions with their own councils of people's commissars in the first months of Soviet power, and somewhat later of the Petrograd Labour Commune.

Lenin's idea of the state alliance of the peoples of the Soviet land in a socialist federation led to proposals concerning the relationship between Soviet Russia and the Soviet Ukraine (beginning of December 1917), whose national rights and independence had been acknowledged "without reservations and unconditionally". To determine the basis of the new relationship it was suggested to "conclude a treaty" on federation.

The views on autonomy, too, began to crystallise at this time. On December 4, 1917, Lenin signed the Ordinance on Land Commissions, which referred to the state integrity of the Soviet land and for the first time associated the concepts of autonomy and federation, defining the autonomous entities as members of the federation.

The Party's option in favour of the federative principle reposed on two factors: a) as before, the Party put its trust in democratic centralism; b) developments had shown the advantages of national statehood for the revival and comprehensive development of formerly oppressed peoples in socialist conditions. Setting out on the socialist revolution, Lenin said, we expected to attract other nations—the Ukraine, Finland—not by force or imposed unity, but by letting them create their own socialist system, *their own Soviet republics*.¹

By approving Lenin's "Declaration of the Rights of the Working and Exploited People" on January 12, 1918, the Third All-Russia Congress of Soviets officially accepted federation as the basis for the development of national states. "The Russian Soviet Republic," the Declaration said, "is established on the principle of a free union of free nations, as a federation of Soviet national republics."² Lenin said: "The Third Congress of Soviets has opened a new epoch in world history" by affirming once and for all "the new system of the socialist Soviet Republic as a federation of free republics of the

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 495.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 26, p. 423.

different nations inhabiting Russia". The new system, he said, "is not an invention or a party trick, but is the result of the development of life itself".¹

The Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR) constituted by the Third All-Russia Congress of Soviets represented not Great Russia, but the entire Soviet land—a gradually shaping united Soviet multinational state encompassing sovereign Soviet republics, and through them also autonomous national entities.

The Party's initial plan had much in common with Lenin's proposals of September 1922 concerning the constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). This applies first of all to the idea of using different forms of national statehood within the united Soviet multinational state, as planned soon after the October Revolution. But the initial scheme was in many respects indefinite (the types of federation were only vaguely intimated), whereas the structure of the Soviet Union was based on already tested forms of union and signified the birth of a new, higher type of Soviet federation.

Why was the initial plan only partly implemented? The main reason was that to shape new national relations proved much more difficult than had been expected. Furthermore, the situation was further complicated by the bitter struggle of the working people of all nationalities against foreign and internal enemies. The bourgeois-nationalist counter-revolutionaries, helped by foreign imperialists, did their utmost to infect the peoples with nationalism and chauvinism, encouraged separatist tendencies and succeeded in severing a number of peripheral areas from the Soviet land for a fairly long period by creating bourgeois national states.

This retarded the creation of an integral union state. Even those peoples which had on the eve and immediately following the October Revolution favoured a fully integrated multinational state or various forms of autonomy within its framework, had under the influence of certain national processes during the foreign intervention and the civil war begun to incline in favour of independent Soviet national republics. This proved to be appropriate and necessary for better mobilising the

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 26, p. 479.

working people of formerly oppressed nationalities to fight jointly with the Russian people against foreign and domestic counter-revolution, rallying the formerly oppressed peoples and drawing them into socialist construction.

Shaping the state relations between the sovereign Soviet republics proved difficult in content and took a longer time. For a number of years, the 8th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party found, they had existed "as particular Soviet republics",¹ though their particularism was relative by virtue of their close cooperation and mutual assistance.

The autonomous national state entities, on the other hand, were necessarily part of the RSFSR due to their mostly small area and the fact that most of them were enclaves within the state of the Russian people. Furthermore, the forms of autonomy of the smaller peoples (political and administrative) allowed for a quicker definition of the content of their state relations with Soviet Russia than in the case of the sovereign Soviet republics.

The building of the Soviet multinational state, begun in the autumn of 1918, was thus a dual process: on the one hand, the RSFSR was formed on just the basis of autonomy, while, on the other, a state union of sovereign Soviet republics took shape parallel with, and under the leadership, of the RSFSR. This is why, acting on the experience of "uniting a number of national Soviet republics round Soviet Russia", the 8th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party inscribed in the Party Programme on Lenin's suggestion that it was the Party's aim to secure "the federative union of states organised along Soviet lines".²

The development of national states was highly complicated. In the spring of 1919 the situation had become so acute, that the independence of the Soviet Ukraine began to impede mobilisation of her manpower and resources for repulsing the enemy. The search for the most suitable form of uniting the republics continued. The Political Bureau of the Soviet Communist Party, with Lenin participating, even examined the question of a possible fusion of the two republics. In due

¹ CPSU: *Resolutions of Congresses, Conferences and CC Plenums*, Vol. 2, p. 73 (in Russian).

² *Ibid.*, pp. 45, 46.

course, however, a solution was found: Lenin suggested a state union of sovereign Soviet republics on a treaty-based federation, and this was formalised in a decree of June 1, 1919, by the All-Russia Central Executive Committee.

In his theses on the national-colonial question for the Second Congress of the Communist International, Lenin referred to the necessity of "ever closer federal unity".¹ This important theoretical and practical point, based on the results achieved by then through socialist federation, was projected in the further development of the treaty-based federation of sovereign Soviet republics in 1921-1922 and the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

That Lenin and the entire Party always subordinated the national question to the question of working-class power and the future of socialism, was reflected in the attitude to the national statehood of peoples and the forms of their state union. The form of national statehood, Lenin pointed out, should not be an object of dissent among Communists; it should not be an obstacle to concerted, friendly proletarian work. The same applied to the form of the union of proletarian states. "These must be unity in the struggle against the yoke of capital and for the dictatorship of the proletariat," Lenin wrote, "and there should be no parting of the ways among Communists on the question of national frontiers, or whether there should be a federal or some other tie between the states."²

Tractable as to the form of national statehood and the state union of peoples, Lenin and the entire Party were intolerant of the least sign of national exclusiveness, which could disrupt the united front against the joint forces of foreign and internal enemies. In his *Letter to the Workers and Peasants of the Ukraine Concerning the Victories over Denikin*, Lenin wrote that in the long and difficult struggle workers of all nationalities "must maintain the closest alliance, for separately we shall most definitely be unable to cope with the task".³ Slightly more than a month later he raised the question again. While acknowledg-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 147.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 30, pp. 294-95.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 297.

ing the independence of the new national states, he said: "We appeal to their working people. We say: unity of the military forces is imperative; any deviation from this unity is impermissible."¹

During the revolution and the civil war Lenin was still more specific: since Soviet Russia had been the first to light the torch of socialist revolution, thus becoming the real base for the development of the world revolution, alliance with it was not only salvation, but also the supreme manifestation of proletarian internationalism, for every national state. Lenin pointed out that "only the closest alliance between the Ukraine and the Russian Republic will be really invincible in the face of international imperialism, and that at the time of struggle against imperialism there is nothing to be gained by the separation of the Ukrainian state, since imperialism will take advantage of every division to crush Soviet power. Such a division is criminal."²

International in ideology and membership, the Communist Party cemented the rising edifice of the Soviet multinational state. This is why Lenin showed so much concern for the Party's growth in the national areas. The communist parties of the national republics, which had in some cases formed before and in some cases after national statehood, were in all cases a main link attaching the new national states to fraternal Soviet Russia and to each other. That communist parties were formed in the national areas was due to the social needs of the peoples that had begun to make a history of their own, had created (or were creating) their national states, and required their own theoretical and organisational headquarters.

But regardless of the form that the peoples gave their Soviet national statehood, regardless of the essence of its relationship with Soviet Russia, it never occurred to Lenin or the Central Committee to structure the Party, too, along the federative principle.

While noting the existence of republics *separate* from the RSFSR, the 8th Party Congress nonetheless agreed that there should be one centralised Communist Party with one Central

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 326.

² *Ibid.*, p. 326.

Committee directing the Party's work in all the Soviet republics. "The Central Committees of the Ukrainian, Latvian and Lithuanian Communists," it ruled, "have the powers of regional committees of the Party and are wholly subordinate to the CC RCP."¹

The meaning of this for the unity of the independent Soviet republics may be illustrated by the relationship between the Russian Federation and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Prior to the formalisation of state relations between the two fraternal republics, their alliance was based, in effect, on the solidarity of the labouring masses and the unity of the communist organisations of Russia and the Ukraine, the leadership exercised in the two republics by the Russian Communist Party's Central Committee. If differences arose between the People's Commissariats of the Russian Federation and the Ukraine, they were referred to, and settled, by the Party's Central Committee. When the Ukrainian leadership displayed excessive independence in the spring of 1919—charting a line of its own on a number of questions and weakening the two republics' united front against the interventionist forces and the home counter-revolution—the Russian Communist Party's Central Committee took immediate measures at Lenin's suggestion to invigorate unity.

Despite the pressure of work and the responsibilities of directing the armed struggle of all the peoples of the Soviet Republic to repulse the onslaught of foreign and internal enemies, and despite the formidable task he undertook of generalising the accumulated experience of building the new society, Lenin always found time to examine the intricate growth of national states and to promote truly fraternal relations among the liberated peoples.

Under his personal leadership and the Party's guidance, a powerful movement for the consolidation of the fraternal alliance, for unity in a single Soviet multinational state, had unfolded with the victory of the October Revolution and expanded continuously in the succeeding five years. The movement was inspired and organised by the international working class.

¹ CPSU: *Resolutions of Congresses, Conferences and CC Plenums*, Vol. 2, p. 74 (in Russian).

The main phases in this unifying movement of the peoples, which materialised in different forms of cooperation and mutual assistance, were:

a) joint revolutionary action of the working people of all nationalities in the fight for the victory of the socialist revolution and the establishment of Soviet power;

b) political and military alliance of the Soviet republics in defending the gains of the revolution against the joint forces of internal and foreign counter-revolution;

c) economic and military alliance to assure the most effective use of material resources for purposes of defence and economic rehabilitation;

d) diplomatic alliance to obtain access to world affairs, and repulse the concerted onslaught of the imperialist bourgeoisie, which ignored the Soviet land as an integral whole and tried to impose unequal treaties and agreements on the individual republics;

e) countrywide support for the idea of a state alliance on the basis of a Soviet, i.e., socialist, federation conforming to Lenin's conception of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

With the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the early socialist transformations, the relations between the peoples changed radically. The shaping of these relations affected many aspects of national development. Six independent and ten autonomous Soviet republics, two Soviet people's republics and 15 autonomous national areas were constituted through 1918-1922. During the military and economic cooperation of the working people of all nationalities to repulse the enemies of the revolution and carry out socialist transformations, their political community became more solid, growing into different forms of state alliance. This confirmed Lenin's prediction made several weeks before the October Revolution that a social revolution would lead to the amalgamation of states that had gone over or were going over to socialism.

The fraternal community of the peoples on the political scene, in the sphere of inter-republican relations, was based on different types of Soviet socialist federation. In the early years after the October Revolution, Lenin suggested federation of a treaty-based type (governing relations between independent republics) and federation based on autonomy (within the

RSFSR). In a resolution drawn up with Lenin's participation, the 10th Party Congress also registered the existence of a form of federation in-between these two types, such as the relationship between the RSFSR and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic or the Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic.

Invigorating the federative union, developing its old forms and finding new ones, and completing the formation of the multinational Soviet state, was one of the key aspects in the political life of the peoples of all the national entities during the passage from war to peace and the subsequent building of socialism.

Certainly, the Party's Leninist policy of establishing socialist national relations encountered difficulties. The first several years of the "new economic policy", which revitalised the capitalist elements and sharpened the class struggle, unavoidably affected national relations and, among other things, produced deviations in the Party towards great-power chauvinism and local bourgeois nationalism.

The viability of the already existing national-state structures was put to the test in the process of building the Soviet multinational state, while a search proceeded for new forms. For example, practice confirmed the advantages of retaining and developing the different forms of autonomous national states and the type of Soviet federation based on autonomy. The nihilistic views of certain leaders concerning the statehood of small peoples, were rejected. So were the premature proposals of accelerating the development of their statehood (in some cases) into independent republics. The need for the intermediate form of federative alliance between individual peoples and the RSFSR, gradually decreased. Byelorussia consolidated itself as a sovereign republic, and Turkestan as an autonomous republic. This was due to the fact that the in-between type of federation was not the product of any objective factors of national relations, but of temporary circumstances.

Improvement and development of the federative relations of the independent republics was in the focus of the Party's and the people's attention. Apart from the independent Soviet republics (in relation to the RSFSR), federation was also

accepted between the Transcaucasian republics. Here, it was, in a way, of a twofold character, because the republics had treaty relations not only among themselves, but also with the RSFSR. Lenin provided the genuinely scientific analysis of the ways and forms to be followed in the further development of the Soviet multinational state. He drew up a clear plan for its final formalisation. At the heart of it was the proposal to form a new and higher type of federative union based on full equality and free will—the Union of Soviet Republics.¹

This new type of socialist federation, resulting in the formation of a union state, eliminated the deficiencies of a federation based on bilateral treaties between the RSFSR and fraternal republics, and of Stalin's proposal of "autonomising" sovereign republics. It raised the structure of the union of free peoples to a higher level. The already enforced principles of the Party's national policy, such as equality, free will, maximum respect for national interests and national feelings, and democratic centralism, now acquired new facets, inasmuch as they blended with a further and deeper growth of Soviet, in substance socialist, democracy. This opened new opportunities for using the union state as an instrument for building the new society, and also for improving the Soviet national statehood of the peoples. Lenin's plan of forming the USSR enhanced the leading role of the Party, and stimulated the creative initiative of the masses in assuring the further progress of socialist national relations, and in building a classless society.

The big and small peoples of the immense country expressed their unbending will to live in alliance and friendship with the Russian people. The magnitude of the Russian people's internationalist exploit, its dedication, were displayed in struggle for the freedom of other peoples, as well as its own. The peoples of the Soviet country could not conceive progress, the building of socialism, without alliance with the Russian people, its heroic working class.

The First All-Union Congress of Soviets, convened on December 30, 1922, performed the will of the peoples inhabiting the country by proclaiming the formation according to Lenin's plan of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, pp. 421-22.

consisting of the RSFSR, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Byelorussian SSR and the Transcaucasian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (incorporating the sovereign Soviet republics of Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia). On Lenin's advice the Declaration and Treaty on the Formation of the USSR, endorsed by the Congress, were again put up for a long public discussion, and it was not until January 1924 that the Second All-Union Congress of Soviets completed the constitutional formalisation of the Soviet multinational state.

The formation of the USSR was an act of proletarian internationalism, a fruitful result of the Party's Leninist national policy. This conspicuous historic event predetermined the victory of the socialist system and invigorated the defensive power and international positions of the world's first multinational worker-peasant state.

Since resolving the national question was one of the crucial objectives in the building of socialist society—an objective on which the future of the new system largely depended—the Communist Party devoted constant attention to the various aspects of national-state development even after the Soviet Union was formed.

Meeting the wishes of the peoples, many new sovereign and autonomous Soviet republics, autonomous regions and national territories were constituted in the past half a century. The Uzbek and Turkmen Soviet republics were formed in 1924, and the Tajik Soviet Republic in 1929. The Kazakh and Kirghiz Soviet Socialist republics were constituted on the basis of the previous autonomous Soviet republics in 1936. And after the Transcaucasian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic had fulfilled its purpose, its constituent Azerbaijan, Armenian and Georgian republics were each incorporated separately into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Then came the reunification of the Ukrainian people in 1939-1945 and that of the Byelorussian people in 1939, the reconstitution and voluntary entry into the Union of the Latvian, Lithuanian and Estonian Soviet republics in 1940, and the formation of the Moldavian SSR following the reunification of the Moldavian people in 1940.

The other forms of Soviet national statehood also made headway. In his report on the 50th anniversary of the Soviet

Union, Leonid Brezhnev mentioned the tremendous significance for the progress and convergence of formerly oppressed peoples of the historic fact that dozens of them, which had never possessed national statehood before, gained it under the leadership of the Communist Party following the establishment of Soviet power. At present, the fifteen sovereign republics forming the Union contain within their framework 20 autonomous Soviet republics, eight autonomous national regions and 10 national territories.

The Communist Party's success in national-state development contributed greatly to the elimination of the national question, which was resolved when socialism was still only being built. The continuous strengthening of the Soviet Union, the improvement of the Soviet national statehood of the peoples, gave momentum to the unexampled transformation, or formation anew, of socialist nations and nationalities, and to their flowering and convergence. This success was based on the joint building by the peoples of the material and technical basis of socialism and communism, the consolidation of socialist social relations, their growth into communist relations, and the moulding of the new man.

The dedicated support of the united Soviet multinational state by working people of all the nationalities guarantees steady growth of its strength and its further development. Conversely, this support derives from the role which the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics plays in the life and development of each of the peoples. The union state follows Lenin's formula of combining the all-Union and republican interests, while giving precedence to the former. This is the guideline in deciding the location of the productive forces and redistributing available material resources and manpower, finances and skilled personnel. For the free peoples of the USSR, the Soviet multinational state was the chief instrument of constructing socialism, safeguarding freedom and independence during the Great Patriotic War, rehabilitating the economy in the postwar period, and advancing the developed socialist society.

Throughout the existence of the Soviet multinational state, the Communist Party has consistently observed the principle of democratic centralism postulated by Lenin. It is still a crucial factor in strengthening the Soviet Union through combining

international and national interests, centralism and constructive local initiative. It was an ironclad rule that the rights of the republican governments were extended in step with the progressive consolidation of the Soviet multinational state. The extension of the rights of the republics in the past 15 or so years, for example, was strictly proportional to the successes of their own development, and still more to their contribution to strengthening the Union.

The international Soviet working class is the main support of the Communist Party in its implementation of the Leninist national policy and in strengthening the Soviet Union.

Addressing the 15th Congress of the Soviet trade unions on March 20, 1972, Leonid Brezhnev commended the role of the working class in the development of Soviet society. Comprising a mighty army of 65 million (two-thirds of them industrial workers), the working class is gaining ever greater prominence as the leading socio-political and economic force in all fields, including the development of nations and national relations.

The Soviet working class fights for the flowering of the nations. At the same time it is the bearer of socialist internationalism, the main social force behind the convergence of nations and nationalities, and embodies in national relations a precise and adequate combination of national and international factors.

Furthermore, the Soviet working class is still the inspirer and organiser of its own alliance with the collective farmers and the working intelligentsia. Under its leadership, this alliance has become a tremendous socio-political force assuring the success of the Soviet people in building communism.

Lenin's Communist Party, the growth of its leading role in communist construction, is the essential source of the strength of the Soviet multinational state, of the fraternal union and friendship of its peoples. The Party personifies the triumph of the ideology of socialist internationalism, the friendship and brotherhood of the peoples. This is reflected in the national composition of the Party and of its local organisations, which have members of dozens, and in the case of some republican communist parties of more than a hundred, nations, nationalities, national and ethnic groups. This makes the

Party's internationalist policy a vital cause of millions of working people of all nationalities.

Leonid Brezhnev stressed: "We take pride in the fact that all the national contingents of our Party merge, like the waters of the rivers in a huge ocean, in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, a union of like-minded Leninists, united in will, in purpose and in ideology.... In solving any problem related to the development of our country, whether political, economic or cultural, the Party will always consider the interests and national features of every people and instil in all Soviet men the spirit of proletarian internationalism, of inviolable devotion to the fraternity and friendship of the peoples of the USSR. This is the only correct national policy. The experience of the Soviet Union's development attests to its being correct and viable."¹

The international composition and internationalist policy of the CPSU is at the heart of its success in consolidating and improving the free union of the socialist nations and nationalities. This deserves emphasis because "*in the course of communist construction, the importance of the USSR as a historically fully justified state form of the joint struggle of free peoples for the programme objectives of the Party and for communist ideals, increases.*"²

All the might of the multinational Soviet state, deriving from the wealth and variety of its resources and the action unity and high degree of organisation of the entire people, is concentrated on coping with the gigantic problems of communist construction.

Mindful of the programme objective of strengthening the multinational Soviet state and developing the Soviet national statehood of the peoples in the setting of communist construction, the 24th Congress of the CPSU said in its Resolution: "It is necessary to continue carrying forward steadily the Leninist policy of consolidating the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the basis of the common interests of the Soviet state, taking into account the conditions of the development of each of its

¹ 23rd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Report of the CPSU Central Committee by L. I. Brezhnev, Moscow, 1966, pp. 150-51.

² On Preparations for the 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Resolution of the CC CPSU, p. 20.

constituent republics, and working steadfastly for the further flowering of all the socialist nations and for their gradual drawing together.”¹

2. LENINISM AND RELATIONS BETWEEN SOCIALIST STATES

The solution of the national question in the Soviet land is significant not only internally, but also internationally.

Commending the Soviet success in uniting peoples as one fraternal family in a multinational state, Lenin attached immense importance to using the Bolshevik party's experience for patterning the fraternal relations between all sovereign socialist states.

Identical social-economic systems, aims and objectives of the proletarian dictatorship states in a world where capitalism had superior strength, necessitated the maximum unity of all socialist countries. Lenin regarded the emergence of such unity as the emergence of a new type of interstate relations, which, by analogy with the relations of the independent Soviet republics, he described as federative. However, it follows from Lenin's theoretical legacy and from the relations between the Soviet Union and other socialist countries that the new type of federation had an extremely broad framework and flexible forms, and that its content had a number of highly distinctive features. Not amalgamation in some new state union with common organs of power and administration was important, Lenin held, but such forms and such a content of relations that would, above all, foster unbreakable unity to safeguard the gains of the sovereign socialist countries and lay the foundation for a new classless society.

The sweep and depth of Lenin's analysis, his habitual thoroughness and prudence, are seen distinctly in his study of the content and form of state relations between socialist countries on the international plane. He approached the role and significance of the national question in the context of the essential social objectives of the world proletarian revolution.

Lenin associated the liberation of peoples from oppression and exploitation, their development with extensive use of

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 226.

national statehood as a major means of mobilising the working people for building the new life, as the instrument for building it. He did recognise the progressiveness of forming national states of previously oppressed peoples with the establishment of proletarian dictatorship. Recognising this, he rejected the idea that national-liberation movement in the conditions of socialist revolution, even though they pursued the aim of forming national states, were all counter-revolutionary. In June 1920, E. Preobrazhensky wrote apropos of Lenin's theses concerning the national and colonial question (addressed to the Second Congress of the Communist International): "...After the proletarian revolution wins in London and Paris the national-revolutionary movement in the East will become counter-revolutionary; on RSFSR territory the national movement in Turkestan, Bashkiria and Kirghizia are already counter-revolutionary."¹ In this sentence Lenin underlined the words "in Turkestan, Bashkiria" once, and the word "counter-revolutionary" twice, and further down censured Preobrazhensky's assumption that the socialist countries would be "inevitably" compelled "forcibly to suppress" the entire national liberation movement that did not merge with the world socialist revolution.

In February 1921 Lenin also criticised V. P. Zatonsky's opinion that "in the conditions of the burgeoning proletarian revolution, national ideology is in substance counter-revolutionary". Neither did he agree with Zatonsky that in a revolution all national struggle, even though liberative, is negative in character.

Consequently, Lenin acknowledged the progressive quality of national movements of previously oppressed peoples under the leadership of the working class, and also of their ultimate aim—national statehood in the framework of proletarian dictatorship.

Studying the ways and forms in which the national statehood of free peoples emerged, Lenin devoted close attention to the new type of their mutual relations.

Speaking at the Third All-Russia Congress of Soviets (January 1918), which proclaimed Russia a federation of Soviet

¹ Central Party Archives.

national republics, Lenin said in his summing up speech that "more and more diverse federations of free nations will group themselves around revolutionary Russia".¹ In December 1919 he returned to this subject: "We are opposed to national enmity and discord, to national exclusiveness. We are internationalists. We stand for the close union and the complete amalgamation of the workers and peasants of all nations in a single world Soviet republic."² He referred to the necessity of working "for a world federal Soviet republic".³

Lenin's faith in the benefits of unity of sovereign national states stemmed from his conviction that only their dependable alliance could serve as the base of the world revolution when world socialism will have come into being.

Shortly before and during the Second Congress of the Communist International he made a close study of the international aspect of relations between countries adopting socialism.

In his theses on the national and colonial question, he noted that the relations between the RSFSR and the Hungarian Soviet Republic, as well as the Finnish Socialist Workers' Republic, had begun to shape on a federative basis. He took the necessity of unity so much for granted, and his concept of federation was so broad and flexible in content and form, that he spoke precisely of the federative quality of Soviet Russia's future relations with these two sovereign states while, in effect, there were yet no juridical acts defining the essence of such relations.

Lenin firmly rejected the standpoint of E. Preobrazhensky, who in his remarks on Lenin's theses on the national and colonial question for the Second Congress of the Communist International practically ignored the significance of the national question. In Preobrazhensky's statement that "solution of the nationalities question should be subordinated to the task of creating a single economic entity out of the existing socialist republics", Lenin put a circle round the word "subordinated" and wrote above the text: "Impossible simply

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 481.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 30, p. 293.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 297.

to subordinate: compare my paragraph 12".¹ This paragraph referred to the extreme complexity of solving the national question, the difficulty of living down national mistrust and nationalist prejudice. "It is therefore the duty of the class-conscious communist proletariat of all countries," Lenin wrote, "to regard with particular caution and attention the survivals of national sentiments in the countries and among nationalities which have been oppressed the longest; it is equally necessary to make certain concessions with a view to more rapidly overcoming this distrust and these prejudices."²

Neither did Lenin agree with Preobrazhensky about the ways of bringing the backward colonial peoples into alliance with socialist countries. Referring to the raw materials provided by the colonies which socialist Europe would require, Preobrazhensky wrote that "... if it proves impossible to reach an economic agreement with the leading national groups, the latter will inevitably be suppressed by force and economically important regions will be compelled to join a union of European Republics"³ for as long as the labouring masses liberated from their local bourgeois upper crust do not form groups capable of assuming power on the basis of federation with Europe. Lenin underlined the word "inevitably" thrice and the rest of the words up to and including "republics" once, making the following note at the bottom of the text: "... it goes too far. It cannot be proved, and it is wrong to say that *suppression* by force is 'inevitable'. That is radically wrong."⁴

Lenin also disagreed with Stalin, who thought it unavoidable to employ the principle of confederation alongside that of federation in arranging relations between sovereign socialist states. In his remarks on Lenin's draft, Stalin had suggested on June 12, 1920 to include in the paragraph of the theses, which referred to the role of federation as a form of transition to the complete unity of the working people of different nations, a definition of confederation which, in his opinion, could also serve as a transitional form. Stalin wrote that the Soviet type of federation can and must be considered feasible as the way to

¹ Central Party Archives.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 151.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 555.

⁴ *Ibid.*

international unity in the case of nations that were formerly part of the old Russia. The relations with Soviet Russia of other peoples taking the socialist road, he wrote, would be better served by the principle of confederation. He referred first of all to peoples which had earlier possessed a developed statehood, such as Germany, Poland and Hungary. State relations between Soviet Russia and formerly backward and dependent countries should be of the same nature.

Lenin made a thorough study of Stalin's proposals concerning confederation. In Stalin's letter of June 12, 1920, he underlined the word "confederation" and made the following note: "Is this so?"¹ Furthermore, on a printer's proof of the theses he made another note beside the reference to federation: "7.+confederation? (Stalin)". But so far as this question was concerned he changed nothing either in the theses or in his report to the Second Congress of the Communist International.

Obviously, Lenin did not wish to restrict the future freedom of action of proletarian parties affiliated with the Comintern in matters of mutual relations of socialist states. He did not deem it necessary to work out a definition of the future conditions and the possible forms of alliance; his idea was that the alliance should proceed from the necessity of ensuring unity, free will, full equality. Referring in his theses to the already shaping socialist federation of states of proletarian dictatorship, Lenin emphasised that federation is always a union of equals. Mindful of the benefits of this form, which had been tested in practice, Lenin said in his theses that the Communist International should not only continue to develop it, but also "to study and test by experience" newly arising federations.²

It is important to emphasise Lenin's reference to the necessity of seeking the closest possible alliance of all the national and colonial liberation movements with Soviet Russia. He defined the forms of this alliance in keeping with the degree of development of the communist movement among the working class of each country, and of the bourgeois-democratic liberation movement of workers and peasants in

¹ Central Party Archives.

² See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 147.

the backward countries or among backward nations and nationalities. True, the reference was to the Soviet country's alliance with backward peoples, but the important point was Lenin's precept that the forms of the alliance should depend on the concrete situation, the level of the consciousness of the popular masses. He expressed the same idea repeatedly in reference to conditions in the Soviet land.

For Lenin *unity of peoples* on the socialist road always held the highest priority. He continuously stressed its significance, amplifying that the actual forms of union would be determined by the progress of the joint struggle against imperialism, the joint building of the new life, and the experience of fraternal cooperation.

It is useful to follow Lenin's approach to the actual forming of socialist federation, to its content in the several stages of mutual relations between the Soviet national states, entities and also between the Soviet land and the socialist states which arose soon after the October Revolution outside the boundaries of the former Russian empire. This helps to distinguish between the several types of socialist federation suggested by Lenin: a) one multinational country, b) relations among socialist countries on an international scale.

Military alliance was the first historically determined content of the federative union of the sovereign Soviet republics. Initially it was formalised in the All-Russia Central Executive Committee decree on the union of the Russian, Ukrainian, Latvian, Lithuanian and Byelorussian republics "for struggle against world imperialism", adopted on June 1, 1919. The decree envisaged merging the military establishments and the command, the people's economy councils, the railways and their administration, and the commissariats of finance and labour. And though a short time later power in all the republics allied with Soviet Russia was seized by local counter-revolutionaries and foreign imperialists (only the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was revived in December 1919), the scanty available experience enabled Lenin to draw the conclusion that the alliance of the republics had been a treaty-based federation. He referred to the All-Russia Central Executive Committee decree of June 1, 1919 as "the treaty", implying "close federation" of the RSFSR and Ukrainian SSR.

Early in the summer of 1920, when preparing for the Second Congress of the Communist International, Lenin renewed his study of the content of a peoples' federative union. Working on the national and colonial theses, he made the following note in his rough outline: "Experience of the RSFSR: concrete account of the *content* of federation: (railways, posts, military, *national economy*, and so on)".¹ As the end of the civil war approached, he gave priority to the economic factor. Defence took second place. This also applied to the content of the socialist federation as the basis of relations between peoples within the RSFSR, and to the alliance of the sovereign Soviet republics. This is seen clearly from the worker-peasant treaties of alliance concluded by them at the end of 1920 and in the beginning of 1921.

Lenin's analysis of the relationship between the peoples of the Soviet land prior to the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the historical evidence of these relations before the institution of all-Union administrative organs, lead us to important conclusions. The following was common for all the listed types of Soviet socialist federation:

a) the ideology of proletarian internationalism; b) the multinational working class of Russia held the leading role; c) the Communist Party—the ruling party—held leadership in all the national states; d) there was a single political form of proletarian dictatorship—Soviet power; e) the existence, and further development after the socialist revolution, of a historically shaped division of labour, and of economic and cultural ties between the peoples of the former Russian empire; f) various juridical acts concerning the procedure and regulation of state relations, adopted at different stages; g) temporary, joint organs of power and administration (united people's commissariats, etc.) for several republics.

In addition to defining the substance of the federative ties within the Soviet land, Lenin examined the content of its federative union with the other socialist states that came into being at the time. The special feature of this new type of socialist federation was that only a few of the basic principles of federation we have just listed, and which were in evidence in the Soviet land, applied here.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 41, p. 438, 5th edition (in Russian).

The main and determining principle of federative union between the Soviet land and other socialist states was the ideology of proletarian internationalism, which followed from the identity of the class aims and interests of workers of different nationalities. The ideas of the socialist revolution, of proletarian internationalism, as Lenin saw it, "are awakening the working people's class-consciousness and are organising them into a solid alliance..." not by "dividing, as ancient Rome's harsh maxim required, but by uniting all the working people with the unbreakable bonds of living interests and a sense of class."¹

For Lenin and the Communist Party the substance of the Soviet country's policy towards a national socialist state of any people was rooted precisely in the principles of proletarian internationalism. Whether or not treaties had been concluded, no common organs were created to administer mutual relations and cooperation. This was a typical feature of this new, socialist type of federation.

Along with proletarian internationalism, Lenin considered the identical, theoretical and political activities of the Communist parties ruling in the socialist states and united in the Communist International as the cornerstone of the new, socialist type of federation. Significantly, when the split in the ranks of the Hungarian working class was overcome, Lenin hailed this development, but repeatedly warned the Communist Party of Hungary against dissolving itself in the ranks of the Social-Democratic Party. This would inevitably cause vacillation in the government's conduct of truly revolutionary policy, on the one hand, and complicate the international relations of the Marxist parties and the countries they directed, on the other.

On April 15, 1919, with the Hungarian and Bavarian Soviet republics already in existence alongside the republics of the Soviet land, Lenin said that the Communist International "now rests on an unprecedentedly firm base, in the shape of several *Soviet republics*, which are implementing the dictatorship of the proletariat and are the embodiment of victory over capitalism on an international scale".²

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 480.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 29, p. 307.

The main principles of mutual state relations among socialist countries were worked out and put into practice simultaneously with the formulation of the typical features of the socialist federation that had begun taking shape after the October Revolution. Here, too, Lenin's guidance was invaluable.

The first principle was: mutual respect, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, complete equality and free will in choice of forms of relationship and cooperation. And the Soviet land set the example of its consistent observance. Soviet policy towards other peoples and countries, Lenin said, was aimed at achieving unity and alliance not "by force or imposition but by allowing them to set up their own socialist system".¹

The second principle was consistent observance by each people of its national and state sovereignty. Sovereignty, we might emphasise, was exercised fully and directly. It may be recalled that the Soviet republics in the territory of the former Russian empire enjoyed full sovereignty, exercising it both directly and through the joint organs of power and government of several or all of the republics. At first, there were the All-Russia Central Executive Committee of Soviets and joint people's commissariats, and later the organs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This was not part of the relations between the Soviet land and other friendly socialist states, though these, too, favoured a federative type of inter-state relations.

The third principle was consistent mutual assistance, and sharing the responsibility for the future of socialism. Lenin personally formalised this principle in the treaty between Soviet Russia and proletarian Finland. "In concluding peace with the workers' government of Finland," he recalled later, "we, the representatives of socialist Russia, recognised Finland's absolute right to the whole territory, but it was mutually agreed by both governments that Fort Ino should remain in Russia's hands 'for the defence of the joint interests of the Socialist Republics'...."²

In the autumn of 1918, acting on the experience of relations

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 26, p. 495.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 27, pp. 379-80.

of the first Soviet republics, the Soviet land as a whole, with the Finnish workers' socialist republic, assurance of unity of newly emerging socialist states was defined as a crucial objective of the policy of parties in the burgeoning Communist International. The Appeal, "To the First Congress of the Communist International", said: "The world situation now requires the maximum contact between different sections of the revolutionary proletariat and a full-scale bloc between the countries where the socialist revolution has already triumphed."¹

The relations between the socialist countries showed quickly that there were many ways and means of exercising the principle of mutual assistance and common responsibility for the future of socialism: revolutionary actions, political support, military aid and food supplies. Soviet Russia and Soviet Hungary even discussed the provision of fuel, skilled labour and specialists.

The Soviet land set the example in implementing the principle of mutual assistance and showed concern for the consolidation of socialism in other countries. This may be illustrated by the varied help provided to the revolution that had broken out in Germany, and by the support given to the Hungarian Soviet Republic.

Lenin stressed that every newly-arising socialist state must be the ally of the Soviet land. In those days this was necessary to safeguard the new state from the onslaught of international imperialism, and was the supreme manifestation of proletarian internationalism. Only the closest alliance with the Russian Republic, Lenin emphasised, could make it invulnerable to international imperialism.

He attached paramount importance to the unity of all socialist states not only because alliance was desirable at the time for military, political and economic reasons, but also because of his keen understanding of the objective laws of social development. For him the content and forms of the state relations between socialist states were directly dependent on the worldwide processes of internationalisation in general,

¹ *The First Congress of the Communist International*, Moscow, 1933, p. 254 (in Russian).

and on the shaping of a single world economy in particular.¹

When in a number of countries the working class heading the labouring masses took the path of socialist revolution during and after the Second World War and the world socialist system began to take shape, the facts confirmed Lenin's principles of relations between socialist countries and also the ways of exercising them in conformity with the concrete historical situation, with the role and significance of the national question.

Presenting his theses on the "very complex" (as he described them) national and colonial questions at the Second Congress of the Communist International, Lenin emphasised that precise study of the concrete historical situation should take precedence over abstract or formal principles. In the circumstances prevailing at that time, he laid the main accent on the economic factors. Nowadays, too, analysing the mutual relations of socialist countries, we are all the more obliged to consider the differences in economic levels and the different degrees of benefit from economic cooperation. Among the other factors named by Lenin are the relations between the countries prior to the establishment of working-class power: how they evolved historically, and whether or not a given country was the oppressor or the oppressed.

Also highly relevant is Lenin's tenet that, bringing the proletarians and the labouring masses of all nations and countries closer, should be the cornerstone of the policy of the Communist parties.²

The practice of the fraternal alliance of the USSR and the People's Democracies, and the alliance between the latter, shows that the Marxist-Leninist parties embodied much of what Lenin had suggested in the content of their mutual relations. This applies to various aspects of the socialist countries' economic, political and military cooperation.

The teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin on the national question, and Lenin's precepts on the ways and means of national states advancement in socialist conditions determine as one of the main tasks of the working class and the

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 246; Vol. 20, p. 28; Vol. 21, p. 39; Vol. 31, p. 147.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 146.

Communist parties of all countries the necessity to strengthen to the utmost the unity of the socialist community, while assuring the interests of each of its member-countries. No matter what forms the relationship of the socialist countries may assume, their foreign and home policy must conform with the vital requirement of safeguarding and consolidating the world socialist system. Violations of unity act as a brake on the entire world revolutionary process. Absolutely no motive is valid for disrupting the world socialist system. Lenin's postulate that the interests of world socialism come before those of any separate nation-state is inviolable.

The present international situation, and first and foremost the correlation of forces, necessitates continuous strengthening of the unity of the world socialist system. The demarcation line between independence and isolation is extremely mobile. Moreover it is not always determined by just the country's working class and Marxist-Leninist party. When independence and self-sufficiency are overemphasised, violations may occur due to the obtaining situation, and, among other things, due to the changing correlation of the forces of the two systems.

The Communist and Workers' parties are doing their utmost to advance mutual relations and promote cooperation between countries of the socialist community.

The further deepening and development of socialist economic integration, says the Comprehensive Programme "shall continue to be implemented in accordance with the principles of socialist internationalism, on the basis of respect for state sovereignty, independence and national interests, non-interference in the internal affairs of countries, complete equality, mutual advantage and comradely mutual assistance. Historical experience has fully confirmed the viability of these Marxist-Leninist principles of interstate relations of a new type which fully comply with the objective requirement of strengthening socialist construction in every country, satisfy the conditions for the development of the world socialist system, and help to create a firm basis for extensive and fruitful international co-operation."¹

¹ *Comprehensive Programme for the Further Extension and Improvement of Co-operation and the Development of Socialist Economic Integration by the CMEA Member-Countries*, p. 15.

CHAPTER SEVEN

SOCIALISM AND THE MUTUAL INFLUENCE AND ENRICHMENT OF NATIONAL CULTURES

1. CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND NATIONAL CULTURE

Broadly, Marxist-Leninist science understands culture as the sum-total of a society's achievements. The components of culture are results of man's constructive activity in the material realm, as well as in the realm of the spirit. The creation of values is part of culture. So are the means of man's activity transforming the surrounding world and himself, and so are social psychology and ideology, and their reflection in people's behaviour. But the concept "culture" is often used in a more narrow sense, referring to spiritual culture (values in the domains of science, literature, art, morality, education, etc., as well as their production, distribution and consumption).

The culture of every nation and nationality is an integral part of the cultural development of mankind at one or another stage in history. The more developed the culture of a nation or nationality is, the more numerous are the universal elements it contains. These take shape through people's constructive activity to elevate their national culture — a pursuit unthinkable in isolation from, and without mutual enrichment and interaction with, other national cultures.

In an antagonistic society culture is a class culture due to the conflicting interests and conflicting social-historical practice of the hostile classes.

In contrast to this Marxist and consistently scientific and materialistic definition of the essence of culture, ideologues of capitalism have an entirely different, unscientific and idealist explanation. In their view communities of people in gen-

eral, such as tribe, nationality or nation, possess a specific creative soul, and to this they impute the origin of different cultures.

To say nothing of the biological school of thought, based on man's allegedly "immutable nature", the idealistic-psychological concepts, too, expound "the immutable faculties of the human soul". Biological and anthropological sociology, like the idealistic psycho-sociology or ethno-psychology, separate culture from its material foundation, from the economic and the social. This results in notions about "eternal types" or configurations of culture, "cultural relativism", and the like. Their exponents maintain that any mutual influence or enrichment that may occur between cultures results in their eclipse, rather than development.

Unlike the idealistic concept of culture, historical materialism postulates that the mode of production of material life conditions both the socio-political and spiritual processes. Marx and Engels distinguished between material and spiritual cultures, but showed that they are closely linked and continuously interactive.

It is becoming increasingly difficult to distinguish developed nations by their material culture. Internationalisation is much too intensive in this field. Part of the spiritual culture, too, is international. As we already know, it embraces the sum-total of all the forms of the social consciousness, as well as the customs and skills, and the means of creating spiritual values, etc. The public consciousness, for its part, encompasses the sum-total of views, notions and theories both on the plane of the social psychology acquired by people under the influence of their daily surroundings, and on the plane of ideology, which is a higher level of public consciousness, being the system of ideas and theories expressive of the interests and needs of a definite social class.

While it is wrong to regard scientific knowledge as being national, because it is obviously universal, it is no more correct to regard ideology (political, juridical, philosophical, ethical, artistic, and other views) as being national, mainly because of its class character. The same applies to social psychology, which is the sum-total of social feelings, notions, sentiments, emotions, and also illusions and prejudices.

On the other hand, such elements of spiritual culture as literature and art, certain traits of behaviour, habits and traditions, the upbringing, and the like, possess clearly specific national overtones. But even here capitalist society has no national culture integral in content (and now no national culture in form either, in the case of the anti-popular modernistic culture), though many bourgeois ideologues and nationalists are at pains to "prove" the contrary.

It should be clear that the culture of a nation and national culture are not one and the same. They coincide only when it is obvious that the "national" refers to the entire culture of the entire nation. But in that case the culture of each nation consists of two national cultures—the progressive and reactionary.

Supra-class theories and the idea that national culture is integral were proved reactionary and wrong by V. I. Lenin.¹ Summing up, he said, "There are two national cultures in every national culture."²

There are those who try to revise this proposition, insisting that it is "conditional", that its sense is purely ideological and political, and not aesthetic. They allege that in Lenin's reference to the "culture of the Purishkeviches, Guchkovs and Struves" the word "culture" was a political term, since the listed reactionaries had created no culture. But what Lenin meant was the entire bourgeois and clerical spiritual culture (including the arts) of the servants of reaction and serving reaction.

Still more frequent are attempts to reduce Lenin's proposition to a simple figure of speech. This is at best a reluctance to analyse this extremely complicated and important question. The expression "two national cultures" is figurative, but precisely as a figure of speech it underscores a very important and deep point. It is highly significant for a correct understanding of the essence of a nation with a capitalist system, and for working out the right policy, strategy and tactics with regard to national, as well as class problems.

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, pp. 246, 533, 541, 548; Vol. 20, pp. 22-26, 32-39, 289-91.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 20, p. 32.

Yet Lenin's "two national cultures" have nothing in common with the contempt for past cultural achievements shown by the "proletarian culture" school or by the Maoists. Take any example of Lenin's attitude: he distinguishes between the democratic national culture and the bourgeois, but for him the criterion is not the class affinity of the makers of a culture, but which of the classes this culture serves.

The fact that in a capitalist society both the democratic and bourgeois cultures are expressed through manifold manifestations of one and the same national form does not mean that they represent a single, integral national culture.

"The *elements* of democratic and socialist culture," Lenin wrote, "are present, if only in rudimentary form, in *every* national culture, since in *every* nation there are toiling and exploited masses, whose conditions of life inevitably give rise to the ideology of democracy and socialism. But *every* nation also possesses a bourgeois culture (and most nations a reactionary and clerical culture as well) in the form, not merely of 'elements', but of the *dominant* culture."¹

The term "national culture" is more narrow in meaning than "culture of a nation". In an exploiter society it applies not to the entire culture of the nation, but only to its ethnic element, represented mainly in the language, the life style, and the forms of art and literature. It is precisely in these components that culture performs the function of ethnic differentiation, that is, a function which, among other things, distinguishes the culture of one nation from the culture of others, and which is in this sense national, meaning implicit in the entire nation or nationality.

In the broad sense, culture as a whole cannot be one for a nation consisting of hostile classes. Yet it is wrong to infer any national nihilism from this denial of the "community" of national culture in capitalist society, especially since these "communities" exist for the overwhelming majority of people in the nation and are manifest fully in their true substance in socialist nations.

Vindicating the capitalist practice of national antagonisms, nationalists describe national community as the product of the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 24.

same "emotional involvement" in the national reality of the members of each nation.

But such "emotional involvement" in the national life can be shared only by members of a nation who have truly common vital interests and aims, viz., the working people, the popular masses.

Every people clothes its culture in the national form, shaped by the specific conditions of life, custom, tradition, language, and the like.

In contrast to the idealistic conception of national feelings, dialectical materialism sees them as the result of people's social and historical practice based on a community of economic ties, language and territory.

National feelings cannot be separated from class feelings. People live within a society, developing forms of communication, material and spiritual culture, scientific knowledge, ethical standards, and aesthetic values. It is this that gives rise to the loftier human needs and the related feelings.

Since the environment people live in is not simply a social medium, but a national-social medium, their requirements and feelings contain definite national overtones. Emotions related to the interests of one's nation or nationality, to its virtues and its part in general human progress, and also the closer aesthetic affinity with local nature, local language, art and literature, assume the form of national feelings.

Every people living in comparatively identical, primarily natural, conditions, acquire a definite dynamic stereotype of artistic perception and reproduction of the surrounding reality. This specific aesthetic appreciation of the world is also connected with the general (universally human), but is richer than the general because it also reflects certain individual features of nature, and of the economic, political and cultural development of the nation.

In its national music, art and literature, a people naturally reflects the progressive in the problems that many peoples have in common, and also the related feelings and thoughts. But in addition it also imparts to them its national manner of conveying these feelings, conveying their emotional tone.

The aesthetic feelings and needs of people arise in the course of their social-historical practice. The common and

different that people of different nationalities display in their aesthetic relationship to reality stem from the common and different in the content of their social-historical experience. A truly national artist expresses the international and the peculiarly national as a unity. While artists of one nation show different facets and hues of their aesthetic relation to reality, the artists of different nations also add to this diversity their specific vision, shaped by the national milieu.

An artist living in definite national conditions shares in the concerns and struggles of his people, absorbs definite aesthetic feelings from its folklore and folk art, and also its artistic idiom of symbols. The reality he reproduces in the familiar national form is naturally more deeply understood by members of his nation, helping them to apprehend the world.

The national form of reproducing and apprehending reality helps in learning this reality and constitutes an independent value for its possessors.

It is unthinkable to ignore or underestimate a culture's national form, because it places the socialist content of that culture within the reach of the masses of the nation concerned.

The Central Committee's Report to the 25th CPSU Congress contains expressions of satisfaction with the fact that the art and literature of the Soviet Union are developing fruitfully in the dozens of languages of the peoples of the country and in a sparkling variety of national forms. But it should also be remembered that in the course of the cultural revolution the cultures of different nations have acquired international elements. The national colouring makes them comprehensible to all nations. The national means of artistic expression are therefore valuable also as a means of introducing individual nations to world culture in what is for them the most comprehensible and accessible form.

2. THE DEVELOPMENT AND RAPPROCHEMENT OF SOCIALIST NATIONAL CULTURES

The culture of socialist nations is the continuation and development of the democratic and socialist elements of national cultures that evolved in the preceding epochs. But it is new in quality, because as an entity (not only component by

component) it comes into being in the conditions of the socialist system.

In the course of socialist construction the interaction, interpenetration and mutual enrichment of national cultures become more and more intensive. Also, it is new in character. The potential scope of the process stems objectively from the nature of progressive culture. Even in capitalist society multifold ties arise between peoples once local and national exclusiveness is overcome. But there nationalism and chauvinism inherent in the private property system hold up the progressive tendency towards drawing different cultures closer. The bourgeoisie uses cultural ties and contacts with oppressed nations as a means of forcible assimilation, a means of unifying their cultures. This cultural discrimination engenders national isolation, a striving to keep one's culture "pure". The extent to which capitalism holds up the growth and mutual enrichment of truly national cultures is seen from the manner in which the local bourgeoisie, the feudal elements and churchmen safeguard their reactionary culture on the pretext of protecting the "purity of culture".

The many obstacles capitalism erects to the greater closeness of national cultures are only removed by the proletarian dictatorship, the building of the new society. Cultural closeness intensifies as socialist relations develop and gradually become communist relations. Socialism lays a broad foundation for the mutual enrichment of national cultures, while assuring most favourable conditions for each of them: general education in the native language, growth of higher education, science, art and literature, and growth of the national intelligentsia. Mutual enrichment of the cultures of socialist nations and nationalities increases as they become more socially homogeneous and acquire common interests and aims.

The international character of nearly the entire material culture and also of a considerable portion of the spiritual culture (science, scientific ideology, and, basically, psychology) is particularly apparent in socialist conditions. The socialist way of life has in many ways similarised the ethics, activity, behaviour, and all that passes as the "sensory culture", of Soviet people. And since national identity is better visible in the

life style, the mode of everyday living, and in the realm of artistic expression, and also, of course, in the languages of different nations and nationalities, we shall in this chapter examine the interaction and mutual influence of national cultures chiefly in the field of art, literature and language. Here, national peculiarities and their connection with the international, the common element in the spiritual life of many peoples, stand out more distinctly, more strikingly and diversely.

The culture of the Soviet nations is shaped by the single socialist economy and ideology. Besides, the artistic perception and reflection of reality follows a single method. Old-time survivals in people's minds are overcome, their sense of socialist internationalism is stronger, and the international aspects of culture gain more prominence. But this does not lead to any mechanical levelling or monotonous similarity of national cultures. On the contrary, they come into bloom and develop in many different ways.

The coming together and mutual enrichment of cultures tends to proliferate genres, styles, and means of expression. And the finest achievements of the culture of each nation also become the possession of other nations.

At present, the deep ideological and creative mutual influence and enrichment of the fraternal literatures is an indispensable condition for the further growth of the multinational Soviet arts. Socialism shows clearly that the truly national develops through the broad interaction and mutual enrichment of the cultures of different nations.

A keen sense of contemporaneity, and the strengthening of the international in the national, are evidence that the very concept of the national is in the act of changing, of becoming richer. While relinquishing nothing of the progressive and useful in their national, the people of the socialist nations acquire a new image consonant with the socialist era. This bears out the aphorism that people resemble their times more than they resemble their parents. Continuity is not blind imitation of the old culture.

The birth of the citizen of the new world, the citizen with a new morality, is the most consequential result of the revolutionary reconstruction of society in the Soviet Union.

It is theoretically wrong, and also harmful for the socialist practice of developing and mutually enriching national cultures, to identify the national with the ancient forms. That would be in gross disregard of the revolutionary transformation of national life. The nations' socialist fabric of life engenders a new national culture, retaining just the advanced and progressive elements of the old.

It is no less wrong to identify technological progress and spiritual culture than to dissociate, let alone counterpose, them. The development of technology in general, and of new means of communication, the mass media (radio, television, etc.) in particular, has caused immense changes in the culture of each socialist nation.

True, it is easier to pick the one patriarchal style as the criterion of the national, denying national character to everything modern. But that would mean a reluctance to reckon with factors that progressively conform with the requirements of social development.

The idiom and style of the art and literature of any nation in every epoch are not of a pure type, but the result of the mutual influence of cultures of different peoples.

Certainly the national identity takes shape over the centuries, but it develops and becomes richer in step with social progress, which gives it a new content. In culture, the national is determined first and foremost by the specific epoch, in which there is a deep interaction of the positive traditions of the past and the achievements of the present. Socialist culture is not stripped of national peculiarities, but to accentuate or artificially exaggerate the old is not in the interests of either the practice or the theory of the development of socialist nations. It would be a mistake to impute the national to solely ethnographic or folklore elements, the older the better. Soviet culture has confirmed that every epoch, as V. G. Belinsky said, gives birth not only to its own ideas, but also to its own artistic forms.

Drawing on their own historical experience and that of all other peoples, socialist nations work for clear and rich forms of national culture consonant with its new content.

Each nation and nationality builds its culture with its typical creative skill and experience. This is what preserves the

national identity of culture. It is unique not because it ostensibly escapes the influence of other cultures (this is not even true of the past), but by virtue of the fact that while absorbing the cultural achievements of all peoples, while enriching itself ideologically and aesthetically, it produces its own peculiar idiom in the many forms and genres of art and literature.

Artists of one and the same nation, as we know, may see the world differently. True, there is an element of similarity, stemming from their common national milieu, in their attitude to and assessments of what they portray. But that is only one of the ingredients of the creative individuality of a national artist. National identity must not be conceived as a uniqueness deriving from some autonomous and mysterious national spirit.

No nation or national culture has ever developed in absolute self-reliance and in disregard of the influence of other nations and their cultures.

Encouraging unconditional fidelity to none but the archaic traditions, the conservative idea of national uniqueness infers a fundamental "incompatibility" of national cultures and opposes their interaction and mutual enrichment.

The broad and profound interaction of national cultures is particularly striking in the socialist environment. The main element in the uniqueness of the cultures of socialist nations is their creatively independent and dynamically civic perception of the times, the striving to apprehend the image of the present, the skill of finding the most essential in the flow of humanity's historical development.

In fact, any truly unique national culture is relevant for all peoples precisely because it is not created within closed and narrow ethnographic frameworks but through the mutual enrichment of cultures, drawing on the ideas of internationalism, humanism and international friendship. This is what makes international culture possible, for it is contained in each of the national cultures expressing the democratic and socialist aspects of the nation's life.

A person may master and understand any national literary and artistic language, apprehend its figures and images, and the thoughts and emotions typical of the people speaking that

language; he may become an author and write in that language in the absence of any specific "national spirit" or inborn national feelings: he may learn not only to perceive and understand the "language" of colours, lines and sounds of any nation, and their typically national combinations of tone, but also participate in enriching culture by means of that "language", and do so actively and successfully. Human eyesight and hearing, said to be "intellectual" senses, have unlimited range. But this does not cancel the fact that people who grow up in a specific national milieu are more sensitive in their reactions to what is kith and kin, to their habitual and more familiar art, for which they have a deeper understanding and appreciation.

Yet it is the objective process of interpenetration and mutual enrichment of national cultures that explains why the national in art is not reducible to just that element which distinguishes one nation from another and is exclusive to that nation. If we left out the international elements—the main elements—from the concept "national", we would reduce it to the form only; what is more, to only the accidental and temporary manifestations of form.

The historical experience of any people includes the achievements of other peoples which it has absorbed. And study and identification of the common elements implicit in different nations does not detract from their uniqueness. On the contrary, it tends to accentuate the original created on the basis of common achievements, to accentuate those distinctive elements contributed to the common by the given people. The only way to see a nation as it really is, is to determine both the common and the particular (but not singular) that it has in its make-up.

The arts of a nation, its culture, are not the "self-expression" of some restricted or exclusive national spirit any more than individual works are the simplistic "self-expression" of their authors, the product of a "pure consciousness" independent of the outside world.

Artistic penetration into the life of another nation requires a profound appreciation of the universal being of the national image in the specific stage of social development. Imitation of the cultural experience of another nation, imitation of the

style, of outward traits of the image, prevents rather than helps to understand the truly national in culture.

A superficial perception of the national form leads some writers who wish to show the exclusiveness of the national psychology of their heroes to produce mere parodies, because they try to convey the hero's national features by portraying outward exotic traits. Writers and artists of different nations have time and again opposed the ethnographic folklorist conception of the national. Maxim Tank, the Byelorussian poet, for example, said at the Fourth Congress of Soviet writers: "While retaining its peculiarity, Byelorussian poetry is becoming more intellectual and universal, though some of our critics still tend to clothe it in the garb of a village laddie playing the traditional reed pipe."¹ S. Danilov, the Yakut prose writer, complained that some authors paying tribute to the exotic tend to revive the long since forgotten *shamans*, and are blind to the fact that all this is far removed from present-day life and that the "national types" they depict bear very little resemblance to the people now transforming the austere northern regions and living in step with the times.

Artists who try to keep closer to their national shores, actually often drift away from them, because new specific features have developed in the socialist nations. Outdated forms, too, are no longer acceptable. Sagas that were once artistic works, sound stilted now when some story-tellers, encouraged by certain students of folklore, try the epic form in their treatment of plots and subjects of the new, socialist era.

By virtue of the intensive interaction and mutual enrichment of cultures, the international, all-Soviet element also encompasses the national forms. The Central Asian nations, the people of Daghestan and other nationalities, for example, have, thanks to cultural cooperation with other nations and nationalities, evolved and developed polyphonic singing, ballet, prose and playwriting. They have also adopted many other genres of the fine arts—easel painting, graphic art, sculpture, etc. This use of the cultural achievements of other peoples has, naturally, extended the means for depicting national life. More, this national life has thereby become better

¹ *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, May 31, 1967.

known to the other fraternal peoples. Artists of different nations do not become less national by absorbing the multinational culture of the Soviet people and the achievements of world culture. Quite the opposite. It gives them additional resources for portraying the universally human in their own national. They continue to be national artists, but are no longer nationally limited.

The Programme of the CPSU says: "Attaching decisive importance to the development of the socialist content of the cultures of the peoples of the USSR, the Party will promote their further mutual enrichment and rapprochement, the consolidation of their international basis, and thereby the formation of the future single world-wide culture of communist society."¹

The interaction and mutual enrichment of national cultures accelerate the development and spiritual growth of every people. And, as we know, the more highly developed a people is, the richer and more diverse is its culture. Mutual exchange of cultural achievements enriches all peoples. It helped eliminate the factual inequality of the peoples of the USSR and assured the rapid growth of their national cultures.

Despite special national features, people of all the socialist nations and nationalities possess common international features in all that is main and basic. These international features have become a national possession. This harmony of their spiritual world, for example, can be seen in that an exploiter psychology is totally alien to all Soviet people.

The culture of the Soviet nations absorbs more and more of the international elements of the highly developed culture of all nations, reflecting the increasing similarity of features among people of different nations, the community of their spiritual make-up.

3. THE DIALECTICS OF THE CONTENT AND FORM OF NATIONAL CULTURE

The artistic culture of a nation is one of the forms of cognising and reflecting the life of that nation. But since it also possesses relative independence, its own content and form, it is

¹ *The Road to Communism*, pp. 561-62.

clear that the general as well as the particular — in other words, the international as well as national — in the being of a socialist nation are reflected in its artistic culture, both in content and form.

Instead of showing the complex dialectics of the concept, "culture socialist in content and national in form", it is sometimes dealt with on the social plane only, while the parallel formula, "artistic content and artistic form", is suggested for the aesthetic side of culture. Certainly, studying content and form in works of art and literature from the artistic standpoint is one of the methods of aesthetic analysis. But in the case of a national artistic culture, attempts to single out the national-artistic in its socialist content result in an unjustified contraposition of the socialist and national contents. This anatomising destroys the living ties between the social and aesthetic in the national culture, destroys the dialectics of their interpenetration. Certainly, the world outlook is the core of art (as of culture in general), but this does not mean that the content of art can be reduced to solely its ideological basis. Its foundation also contains everything (the beautiful, the lofty, and the like) reflected by the categories of aesthetics.

The socialist content of art is expressed by the artist in the light of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook not in general, but in national artistic forms consonant with the social-aesthetic ideals of socialism. And the increasing penetration into these forms of international elements means that, like the very internationalist communist outlook, the international absorbed by the culture of the people in question becomes its national possession. It does not signify any fission of the form into national and artistic. Form as the inner structure of the content reflects the socialist life of a nation or nationality as a whole (not as ostensibly coexisting but separate international and national elements), making the content consummate, portraying reality as an integral, as a unity of the national and international.

Inasmuch as the form represents the objective relations and interconnections between the structural elements of the content of a work of art (the images and characters), it also naturally expresses the specifically national aspects of reality.

The content of socialist culture comprises the entire intrinsic cultural wealth of each nation. It is not an abstract socialist content independent of the creative influence of national cultures, and it is produced by all the nations. It is international. But for as long as different nations exist, socialist content will be organised and expressed in different national forms which develop, improve and are enriched by international elements under the guiding influence of the content.

This content, for its part, facilitates internationalisation, the dissemination of the valuable elements of different national forms. This is why the dialectical unity of content and form is not violated. It is assured by the basic changes in the essence of the nations. They have changed into socialist nations. As a result the formula, "culture socialist in content and national in form", expresses the important historical fact that the subject of culture, like the object of literature and art—the individual, his social relations, and socialist reality as a whole—have changed radically. Despite their diversity, many of the principal themes in the works of Soviet writers and artists in the national republics turn out to be the same (collectivisation of farming, industrialisation, the cultural revolution, the Great Patriotic War, and the like). Depicted from a common socialist ideological angle, they are, however, not devoid of national overtones, since socialist content is now the substance of the national being of all the peoples of the Soviet Union.

The dialectics of content and form signifies unity and interaction, but not pure and simple mutual dependence, for we cannot say that since form is national, content must also be national.

The formula, "an art national in form and content", is dialectical only on the surface, on the assumption that form and content comprise a unity and that form is dependent on content. In fact, however, it ignores the main criterion of the arts—the class essence of the system. It takes art as an abstract unity of artistic content and artistic form. It overlooks the fact that art as a form of social consciousness is of social origin, that it represents a unity of the cognitive, ideological and aesthetic. Yet art should not be seen from the purely aesthetic side, for aesthetics is not withdrawn into itself and is linked by a

thousand threads with life and its reflection in the forms of social consciousness.

The socialist in the life of each people becomes a national possession. As such it is reflected in the content of the national culture. The national and international in the culture of nations do not merely coexist, but constitute a dialectical unity. The socialist content of art as a reflection of the progressive in the life of nations is in its entirety a part of international culture, but is also an inalienable asset of the national culture in question. In other words, the formula, "socialist content and national form", expresses the unity of content and form.

The content of the culture of socialist nations is international, common to all of them, and represents a unity with each national form of culture. This is additional evidence of the dialectics of the general and particular. It shows that the separate or particular is also, in one way or another, general. Conversely, the general only exists in the separate, through the separate, the particular. The main traits in the character of every nation are not just national, but also international. The difference between one nation and another does not stem from these traits, but from the specific ways they manifest themselves by virtue of the specific national milieu, which engenders different emotional overtones, a definite system of notions and images. All this relates chiefly to the national form, and through it to the content of the culture of a nation, because it is the form that organises and expresses the content. For its part, socialist content as the leading element determines the development of national forms, but also impels the internationalisation of certain of their components.

Emphasising the tremendous role played by the international in the development of the national, and noting that to isolate the national detracts from its significance, the Armenian poet Yeghishe Charents said at the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers: "If I were to restrict my creative activity psychologically to the framework of national isolation, its range and sphere of influence would indeed be minimal. I am happy to feel myself part of the most advanced current in humanity, because the October Revolution has obliterated from my spiritual perceptions this wretched illusion of national self-exclusions."¹

¹ *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, September 27, 1967.

A thorough analysis of the substance of the formula, "socialist in content, national in form", will show that it is an essentially faithful reflection of the radical changes in the life of nations and, consequently, in the subject and content of the national cultures. It does not contradict the dialectical unity of content and form, for socialist content constitutes the essence of the being of nations, while national form is not confined to the means and methods native to the given culture.

In the socialist environment forms of culture are produced by multinational, and not only national, communities. Take the Soviet people: embodying the socialist essence of all the Soviet nations and nationalities, this new community is the basis for their further development. It is the soil on which national cultures exist and develop. The national is a particular common Soviet element, while the Soviet is a common element for all the nations and nationalities of the USSR.

The increasing identity of interests and the fraternal ties of people of different nationalities, the mutual enrichment of their cultures, add to the international identity of the spiritual life of socialist nations. As for the essential substance of art—its ideological and emotional content expressing the ideas, feelings and aesthetic ideals of society—which is organically linked with the subject matter, the content, it accords to the common and international a clearly principal place. In the art of socialist nations the two sides of its content (the depictive and ideological and emotional) are compounded by the identical world outlook of the artists and their artistic method of socialist realism. As a result, the prevalence of the general and international in the content is still more apparent.

The main object and basic theme of the art of Soviet socialist nations is the Soviet individual and his new social-political and spiritual image. His spirit and that of the artist are attuned mainly to the new social conditions of life (common to all Soviet nations), to the present-day events.

When artists portray the national character of their heroes chiefly as a Soviet character, they thereby register the profound changes in the national. In the novella *Farewell, Gyulsary*, for example, Chinghiz Aitmatov mirrored the experience of social struggle, touched on the essential aspects

in the development of Soviet society as a whole, and showed the lofty meaning of the concept, "Soviet man". The action is presented in a national Kirghiz setting, but its substance and content are socialist and Soviet. The image of the Kirghiz farmer portrays a typical Soviet man, close and understandable to all people in our country, irrespective of their nationality.

Though its subject matter, the content, is chiefly centred on the life of its nation, every national art expresses the relations of people throughout the world. Even when depicting the life of a collective farm or factory, real art portrays substantive events, showing their close bond and interlacement with processes of world-wide, universally human significance.

Soviet writers and artists hold the problem of society and the individual in the foreground. They try to conceptualise the common Soviet, universally human ideas in the context of the communist world outlook. Those who concentrate on outdated national customs and ways of life, lead their national culture to self-isolation. Their work does not amount to much more than an exercise in the exotic or in historical ethnography.

In works of the school of socialist realism the national is closely intertwined with the Soviet, the international. The masterpieces of art and literature, irrespective of the nation, delve into the biggest problems of the time. Take the Russian film *Chairman*, the Georgian *A Soldier's Father* or the Lithuanian *Nobody Wanted to Die*. While distinctly national, all of them reflect the thoughts and aspirations of progressive people of any nationality, engendering thoughts about present-day humanism and progress, which are universal problems.

The culture of every nation holds up the mirror to that nation's history, and the modernity in it is related to that history. All the same, speaking of the national we take it chiefly as it looks today — enriched by all the cultural achievements. While accepting Soviet culture as integral in its national multiplicity, we should remember that this multiplicity has penetrated, and continues to penetrate, every national culture. People of the socialist nations possess the common features of the Soviet character. The nations draw closer to each other not only in the economic and cultural sense, but also in spiritual make-up. Having become the fabric of the socialist nation, the new becomes not only a national possession, but also the

possession of other nations. This is why the flowering of national cultures strengthens and enriches international culture.

4. NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGES OF COMMUNICATION. THEIR PLACE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CULTURE AND THE RAPPROCHEMENT OF NATIONS

Languages play a crucial part in the development of national cultures. The masses partake of their own and other peoples' culture, participate in its further development, chiefly through the medium of their native language, the language they understand. This is why the Communist Party has always tried to assure the complete equality and free development of all national languages and rejected the idea of any forcible imposition on peoples of the language of a dominant nation.

In its first Programme the Party recorded the fact that it was fighting for "the right of the population to be schooled in the native language, assured by the establishment at the expense of the state and the bodies of self-government of the necessary schools; the right of every citizen to speak at meetings in the native language; introduction of the native language ... in all local, public and government institutions".¹

After the socialist revolution in Russia the Party consistently put into effect Lenin's ideas on the equality and free development of languages. All national, including linguistic, privileges were abolished, and the development of languages was promoted. Research centres were set up to study and popularise national languages. Their alphabets were improved. Vigorous steps were taken to enrich their vocabularies, to improve their means of expression. The phonetic systems, grammar and lexicology of unlettered languages were studied and defined. For the first time in their history more than 40 of the unlettered nationalities of the USSR received a scientifically-arranged written language.

The Fifth Congress of Soviet Writers recorded the fact that the literature of the Soviet Union is written in 75 languages,

¹ *The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee*, Part I, Moscow, State Political Literature Publishing House, 1970, p. 63 (in Russian).

whereas the pre-revolutionary literature had only 13 languages.

In the tsarist period, languages of even the bigger nations, with an established literary tradition such as the Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Georgian and Armenian, had a very limited social function. In the Soviet period, instruction in schools and universities is in several dozen languages. Books, newspapers and magazines are put out in scores of languages. Public and government business is transacted in the various languages of the land. Radio and television broadcasting is in local languages. All achievements of modern culture, science and technology, of socialist social relations as a whole, are reflected in both the old and new written languages of the peoples of the USSR.

This unprecedented expansion of the social functions of national languages occurred against the background of socialist relations among peoples. The Party attached great significance to this, because apart from affirming the equal development of nations and their languages, it also assured rapid cultural growth of the working masses and creation of their new cultural values. Besides, in a multinational state like the USSR national languages facilitate the spread of communist ideas through the mass media and educational institutions.

But not all nationalities were able to extend the social functions of their language to the point meeting the needs of the intensive and rich social-economic and spiritual growth of the socialist society. To realise its potential, a language must have a definite minimum of speakers. Favourable social conditions for growth are not enough. Surely, a language spoken in one or two villages, no matter what potentialities it might possess, will hardly be able to extend its social function. In the case of a few nations and nationalities, their relatively small numbers, dispersal, and voluntary acceptance by part of the people of languages of the bigger socialist nations objectively impede any intensive enrichment and improvement of their language. Their languages are still poor in means of expression and practically incapable of meeting the needs of present-day science and technology. The smaller nationalities and ethnic groups (of which there are nearly 60 in the USSR) have only limited opportunities to communicate in their own

language with people in multinational production collectives and in the process of material and spiritual production. Limited, too, is their ability to absorb the riches of world science and culture in their own language. For this reason, in addition to their national language they voluntarily adopt the languages of neighbouring nations, and first of all the most developed one—the great Russian language. Hence the spread of bilingualism.

Bilingualism is widespread not only among nationalities lacking a written language, but is also spreading rapidly among all working people due to the close association and joint life of the many different Soviet nationalities. Large masses of people have mastered a second language, most frequently Russian. This main type of bilingualism is a highly positive factor in the development of Soviet nations and nationalities. Knowledge of one's native tongue and the international Russian language facilitates communication, mutual understanding and coordination in communist construction.

Consistent implementation of the principles of equality and free development—and the resulting uplift of the cultures of all nations and nationalities, the elimination of former suspicions and the unprecedented growth of intercourse—gradually and inevitably led up to the selection of one of the equal languages of the USSR as the common language, a language of communication between members of all the nationalities in the country. Russian was chosen as the most suitable. It is native to the majority of the population: in the 1926 census 57.3 per cent named Russian as their mother-language and in the 1970 census 58.7 per cent (including many non-Russians). Furthermore, Russian has very much in common with the languages of, and is understood by, Ukrainians and Byelorussians, who with the Russians comprise nearly three-quarters of the country's population. Russian was fairly widespread among some of our non-Slav peoples (Mordovians, Tatars, Ossetians, and others) even before the socialist reconstruction. According to the 1970 census, 48.7 per cent of the non-Russian population of the Soviet Union have a

¹ See *Problems of Bilingualism and Multilingualism*, Moscow, 1972 (in Russian).

fluent command of Russian or consider it native. Russian is also preferable as a vehicle of international communication to the other equal languages, since it is more developed and richer, and possesses a number of advantages (e. g., the dialectical disparities are slight, the colloquial and written languages are much alike, its spelling is very close to the pronunciation, etc.)

As the language of international communication, Russian performs a highly progressive mission in the life of all the Soviet nations and nationalities, and in welding the Soviet people as a new historical community. It is a powerful social factor quickening the development of the Soviet socialist society, contributing to closer cooperation and the drawing together of nationalities, to their unity in working for the common aims of communist construction, based on the Marxist-Leninist ideology.

It is wrong to say that national culture in isolation from the native language is always a mere fiction. In certain cases a previously non-native language can serve as the form for the growth of a national culture. Many nationalities and smaller nations (Ossetians, Karelians, Komi, Mari, Mordovians, Udmurts, Khakassians, etc.) use Russian extensively alongside their own language in shaping their national cultures. As the common language, Russian also exercises beneficial influence on the cultures of larger nations.

Not differentiation of languages (evolution of dialects) and not integration in the sense of absorption by another literary language, but mutual lexical and other enrichment of all on a basis of equality, is typical of the socialist era.

A considerable part of direct borrowings are international words, Sovietisms, scientific, technical, literary and political terms.

Mutual enrichment of languages was observed in all ages. No language in the world is pure. Linguists estimate that 60 to 70 per cent of all English words are borrowings from other languages, and for Korean the figure is more than 75 per cent. A third of the vocabulary of the eastern Romance languages is of Slav origin, and so on.

The concern of nationalists for the purity of their language is objectively directed against the progressive convergence of

certain linguistic elements, against the growth of the international stock of words and terms. Referring to the purity of the Russian language, Lenin objected to needless and facetious use of foreign words, because it hampered the spread of literacy and culture among the masses. But he never objected to borrowing words and terms that were necessary and useful.

The national languages of the USSR develop on the basis, first, of their own potentialities, and, second, of elements extensively borrowed from other languages. The Russian language plays a special and multiple role in this mutual enrichment, because for the peoples of the Soviet Union it is the main avenue of access to Russian and world culture. Meaningful, scientifically grounded and thoughtful borrowing of scientific, technical, political and other terms from the Russian, and through the Russian from other languages, makes it easier to learn the language, facilitates communication with Russian-speaking people, and works for the progressive cause of promoting closer unity of the nations and nationalities of the USSR.

Some linguists tried to provide counterparts even for such incontestably international terms as "revolution", "Soviet", "communism", and "cosmonaut", in the national languages. But this only stultified the international lexical resources, the growth of which is a progressive trend.

Many Soviet linguists note that coupled with the intrinsic resources of languages, their mutual enrichment has become an important element of their development in the socialist environment.

The common lexical resources of the peoples of the USSR are expanding continuously and reflect all the aspects of their social-political, industrial, cultural and everyday life.

The languages of non-Russian nations and nationalities, too, influence the Russian language. However, the main source of mutual enrichment is the influence of the Russian, and through it of the more developed modern languages, such as English, French, German, Ukrainian, Georgian and Armenian, on all the other languages of the Soviet peoples.

All languages enrich their vocabulary by borrowing from others, and Russian is no exception. Through the centuries, the Russian language borrowed prolifically from different

other languages, and the same may be said of any other tongue.

Even before the revolution, the Bolsheviks favoured the spread of Russian, and Russia's advanced culture, among other peoples. "We," Lenin wrote, "of course, are in favour of every inhabitant of Russia having the opportunity to learn the great Russian language.

"What we do not want is the element of *coercion*. We do not want to have people driven into paradise with a cudgel; for no matter how many fine phrases about 'culture' you may utter, a *compulsory* official language involves coercion, the use of the cudgel."¹

Practice has proved Lenin right. Voluntary learning of Russian by millions of people in addition to their native language has become a fact in the socialist setting of complete national equality and free development.

According to the 1970 census, in addition to the 128,800,000 Russians, 13 million non-Russians named Russian as their mother tongue, while another 41,900,000 claimed a fluent command of Russian as their second language. So Russian is in the full sense of the word the second native tongue for 54,900,000 non-Russian Soviet citizens. It performs a tremendously important social function as the common language, facilitating the drawing together of peoples and their cultures. Russian is studied by millions of people abroad as well, especially in the other socialist countries.

In socialist society the development of languages is a natural historical, but certainly not spontaneous, process. Experts in linguistics of the universities and academies analyse linguistic processes and devote themselves to improving languages. True, there are also certain flaws. It has been pointed out, for one thing, that all the peoples suffer from the distinction between the spoken and written language. This adds to the difficulty of learning the mother language, of learning to speak correctly, and especially of learning the language used as a vehicle of communication between peoples. The complex spelling rules of some national languages have not been simplified yet, which, of course, doesn't exactly help in

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 72.

learning them. In the main, however, Soviet linguists have managed to eliminate these flaws caused by rapid development and work for the maximum democratism, for simplicity and comprehensibility. They do not hesitate, as a rule, to come to grips with purists who obsessively shield the formal traditions of their language, lamenting its "decline" to the level of a spoken tongue, and thereby retarding improvement of the language and the spread of literacy.

Referring to the critical remarks of a certain purist, a German socialist émigré, concerning the style of Volume II of Marx's *Capital*, Frederick Engels wrote: "The German language in which he delights and which we have had hammered into us in school, with its disgusting construction of periods and with the predicate banished by endless auxiliary phrases ten miles from the subject, to the very end of the sentence—is the kind of German language it took me thirty years to unlearn. This bureaucratic German language of school-teachers, for whom Lessing does not even exist, is now disappearing completely even in Germany."¹

The Russian language owes its present richness, expressiveness and perfection to the immense efforts of progressive sections of Russian society and the labour of many generations of scholars. The language reform of Peter I applied to graphemics, while Tredyakovsky proved the need for reforming Russian orthography; he recommended writing "by the ring of the sounds", that is, on the phonetic principle. The tsarist government opposed the spread of literacy and culture. It was not interested in simplifying Russian spelling rules. In just the second half of the 19th century scholars and teachers submitted many a reform project. But all of them were shelved, save for a few partial modifications.

The Soviet government headed by Lenin decreed a reform of the Russian alphabet (elimination of several unnecessary letters) and of the spelling rules, some of which were abolished or simplified. This was put into effect on December 23, 1917, and on October 13, 1918.

The government decree introducing the new spelling rules pointed to the necessity of "easing the study of Russian writing

¹ Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 36, S. 477.

by the broad masses and liberating the school from non-productive efforts in learning to spell.”¹

In 1964, *Izvestia* published new “Proposals for Improving Russian Orthography”, drawn up by the Institute of the Russian Language of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Despite the faults of these proposals, the ensuing public discussion confirmed that from time to time the rules of a language require modification. But it also revealed the difficulties of doing so, including some of a subjectivist order.

Some of the critics of the “Proposals” were less concerned with the question of what to improve and how, and pleaded for “purity” as an aim in itself. Yet the enrichment of the Russian language by languages of the other fraternal Soviet peoples has long been a prominent feature of its development. It is common knowledge, for example, that Nikolai Gogol introduced to the Russian a large number of Ukrainian words. Pavlo Tychina, too, wove “Ukrainianisms” into the texture of Russian. Taras Shevchenko, on the other hand, who has a number of outstanding works to his credit, including some in Russian, enriched the Ukrainian literary language, one of the most developed languages in the world today, with achievements of the Russian language. The splendid Byelorussian writers Yanka Kupala and Yakub Kolas borrowed many elements from the Russian to enrich their own literary language.

There is no rivalry between languages in the Soviet Union. Nor could there be. The equality of languages in socialist society is complete, and affection for the native tongue does not prevent people from respecting other languages, from knowing and using one of them as the common language. And if some of the smaller nationalities use a language other than their own, this being more convenient, it does not mean loss of their identity. Experience shows that the language they choose to use becomes the new form of expression for their national elements, and ultimately becomes their native language.

¹ *Collection of Statutes and Decisions*, 1918, No. 74, Art. 804 (in Russian).

It is improper in these circumstances to take up the question of what language a member of a nation should be schooled in, for it would invade the sphere of civil rights, would violate them one way or another. Confusing right with obligation, some bourgeois authors speak not of the right, but of the obligation, of citizens to be schooled in their native language. It is "presumed", one critic writes, that citizens of the Soviet Union should get their schooling in their native language. He complains that this is not always so in practice. Certainly not. Because Soviet citizens enjoy the right—but are not obliged—to study in their native language. The equality of the peoples of the USSR implies, among other things, that there is a freedom of choice of language. Every citizen is free to learn or have his children taught in the language of his choosing. If parents send their child to a school with a different language of instruction—a Russian, Ukrainian or special foreign-language school—that is entirely within their rights, and any pressure (even moral) would be as much a violation of the Leninist policy of national equality as compulsory schooling in a non-native language.

The Fundamentals of Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics on Education provides freedom in choice of language in public education. "The pupils studying in the general education school shall be given the possibility of receiving education in their native language or in the language of any other people residing in the USSR. Parents or persons acting in *loco parentis* shall have the right to choose for their children the school with an appropriate language of tuition. In addition to the given language of instruction the pupils may at their wish learn the language of any other people of the USSR."¹

Parents want their children to learn not only their native, but also one or more other languages, to provide a favourable background for their cultural and educational development. Certainly, the native language is psychologically closer, but if only several thousand, and sometimes just a few hundred, people speak that language, it is obviously inadequate for

¹ *The Fundamentals of Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 369.

access to world culture and science. Members of bigger nations, too, need to know non-native languages, first of all Russian, the language of international communication, to facilitate mutual understanding, intercourse and cooperation among the fraternal peoples of the country and to follow on a more comprehensive scale the scientific and other literature translated from foreign languages.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union says in its Programme that it will continue "promoting the free development of the languages of the peoples of the USSR and the complete freedom for every citizen of the USSR to speak, and to bring up and educate his children, in any language, ruling out all privileges, restrictions or compulsions in the use of this or that language. By virtue of the fraternal friendship and mutual trust of peoples, national languages are developing on a basis of equality and mutual enrichment".¹

The development of national languages and their mutual enrichment, the continuing extension of the social functions of Russian as the language of international communication, is historically implicit in the period of communist construction. The development of the native languages enables the masses rapidly to raise their cultural standard, to produce new cultural values, thus enriching the international resources for the development of all peoples. Knowledge of the common language in addition to the mother tongue provides national culture with a new powerful means of growth and expression, and assures a greater mutual enrichment of national cultures, extends and invigorates their international foundation.

To limit oneself to just one's own language for the sake of a falsely conceived national development is contrary to the true progress of nations and nationalities, especially the small ones. Such self-imposed isolation and reluctance to gain access to the Union-wide and world forum through the common language of communication in a multinational country, is an impediment to the spread of the achievements of the peoples, to their mutual enrichment.

Guided by the Marxist-Leninist teaching, the Communist Party works for the elimination of all that may obstruct the

¹ *The Road to Communism*, p. 562.

mutual influence and enrichment of cultures and the full satisfaction of the legitimate needs and progressive aspirations of the working people of all nations and nationalities.

Its policy is aimed at assuring the flowering of national cultures and at consolidating their international foundations not through subordination of the cultures of smaller nations to that of a bigger nation, not by blending them mechanically, but by creating differentiated and favourable conditions for the development of all national cultures, for their interpenetration, mutual enrichment, and rapprochement.

In their speeches at the 25th Congress of the CPSU and congresses of the communist parties of the constituent republics, delegates from Union and autonomous republics, autonomous regions and national areas demonstrated that the intensified exchange of cultural values has become an important factor of growth for national cultures, for their mutual influence, enrichment and drawing ever closer.

The interaction, mutual enrichment and approximation of national cultures, which operate as an objective law, have acquired a still broader basis with the emergence of the world socialist system. Complex and contradictory though it is, the process of the cultural convergence of socialist countries is based on the unity of their economic and political system.

The fraternal friendship of the peoples of socialist countries is apparent not only in economic cooperation, but also in their broad exchange of cultural values. Socialist countries cooperate extensively on the plane of their Academies of Sciences and higher educational establishments, by translating literature, exchanging films, in the theatre, etc. The objective necessity for the cultural consolidation of socialist countries is promoted by the Marxist-Leninist parties to augment the spiritual community of people of different nations. As their social homogeneity becomes more pronounced, the socialist nations create a diverse but still single international culture.

CHAPTER EIGHT

SOCIALIST PATRIOTISM AND INTERNATIONALIST EDUCATION

Resolution of the nationality question in the environment of revolutionary reconstruction is one of the most important factors for creating and developing a socialist fatherland and engendering socialist patriotism.

What qualitatively new elements, elements it alone possesses, are there in this new type of patriotism as compared with the old? How closely, in present conditions, is socialist patriotism, and all-national sense of pride of the Soviet citizen, connected with internationalist education?¹ What makes internationalist education effective, what are its main trends, and its main forms?

The answers are contained in the works of Lenin and the daily practice of the CPSU—and not only in the detailed analyses of the essence of patriotism and internationalism in the stages of bourgeois-democratic and socialist revolution and the early years of the transition to socialism, but also in the important methodological principles outlined for the period of communist construction.

1. THE INTERNATIONAL SUBSTANCE OF SOCIALIST PATRIOTISM

The creation of the socialist fatherland and the emergence of the new type of patriotism is preceded by the maturing in

¹ Lenin's term "internationalist education" is more accurate than the often used term "international education". See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, pp. 346, 353.

the womb of capitalist society of material, technical and ideological preconditions for the victory of socialism.

Once it becomes an obstacle to the growth of the productive forces, capitalism comes into collision with the interests of society. Private ownership of the means of production and the political domination of the monopoly bourgeoisie give rise to social, and also national, antagonistic contradictions. It is these that are at the root of national oppression and the ideology of nationalism and cosmopolitanism.

The small-scale proprietorship that survives in capitalist society is the economic soil for the old-style patriotism. Since it has nothing to do with foreign markets, the petty bourgeoisie is more patriotic than the monopoly bourgeoisie. But its patriotism is narrow and limited. It conceives the interests of its country mainly in independence. It does not associate its future with the perspectives of the world-wide revolutionary process.¹

None but the working class, brought into being by large-scale capitalist industry and whose vital interests require unity on a world scale, is able with the help of the Marxist-Leninist Party to rise to a scientific appreciation of the interests of its country, the nation, and world progress.

The economic situation of the working class, the conditions of its emancipation, and its class enemy, as Lenin showed, are not national, but international.² This is why the working class regards the perspectives of its country's development as dependent on the success of the world communist revolution.

From the standpoint of its class struggle for socialism, the proletariat in the capitalist environment cannot remain indifferent to the fatherland as a given political, cultural and social environment in which it lives and wages its struggle.³

Its labour in the sphere of material production and its political, economic and ideological struggle for democracy, national independence and socialism influence the social and political system and contribute to the economic and cultural progress of the country.

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 187.

² See *ibid.*, Vol. 35, p. 247.

³ See *ibid.*, Vol. 15, p. 195.

But the domination of the capitalist class tends to restrict the efforts of the working class and its allies. The bourgeoisie goes out of its way to keep the consciousness of the masses under the sway of nationalist ideology. The spread of the internationalist outlook is impeded not only by the ideological media, but also by repressions against the communist and workers' parties.

Only abolition of the exploiting classes, establishment of the proletarian dictatorship and public ownership of the means of production can assure the creation of a socialist fatherland and the new type of patriotism.

The political foundation for the new, socialist patriotism, is socialist democracy, which provides unrestricted political rights to all working people, irrespective of nationality. In multinational states the different national contingents of the ruling working class are brought together, as they are with the proletarians of other countries, by the identity of their basic class interests.

These basic interests are expressed through the Communist Party, which is structured along international and class lines, and whose Programme envisages elimination of national oppression and inequality, free material and spiritual development of each nation and nationality, closer friendship, cooperation, mutual assistance and convergence of all peoples.

Economically, socialist patriotism is based on the consolidation of public ownership. And the corresponding socialist relations of production provide boundless opportunities for closer and deeper economic ties between regions of the country, for the specialisation and cooperation of the economies of the Soviet republics.

Public ownership and the common national income create common economic interests on the scale of the entire multinational country. Favourable conditions appear for mutual economic, scientific and technical assistance, for the elimination of any factual inequality among peoples and of the old time suspicions.

Joint use of the multinational country's natural resources, joint labour based on the socialist mode of production, and the single economic plan, assure unprecedentedly high rates of development for each nation and nationality, and the fatherland as a whole.

The concept of fatherland, formerly restricted to the geographical boundaries of the native national area, becomes much broader. For all nations and nationalities "fatherland" as a concept begins to encompass the entire Soviet multinational land.

Socialist patriotism also hinges on the changes in the class structure of society—first and foremost the abolition of the exploiting classes, which cultivate chauvinist and nationalist ideology. The percentage of the working class, the most consistent bearer of internationalist ideas, in the population increases. And the socialist transformation of farming, too, helps eliminate the sources of national narrow-mindedness.

The social basis of socialist patriotism becomes stronger with the consolidation of the worker-peasant alliance and the rising cultural, technical and educational level of the working people. The rapid technical developments in agriculture, the expansion of collective-farm democracy and cultural growth in the countryside, raise the educational standard and proficiency of the farmers and enhance their political consciousness.

Since production needs more hands, there is an influx of people of different nationalities into the old, as well as new, industrial and cultural centres. This, too, helps break the former provincial isolation of peripheral national areas.

Under capitalism only a part of society—the working class and those sections of the population which accept its ideological positions—possessed an internationalist consciousness. Following the victory of socialism, the Marxist-Leninist ideology became the dominant ideology. And precisely this ideology is the source of socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism.

Hence, socialist patriotism has a qualitatively new political, economic, social and ideological foundation. This is what determines its specific and most essential features and its fundamental difference from the old-time patriotism.

Socialist patriotism absorbs all that is best in the old patriotism—one of the "most deeply ingrained sentiments, inculcated by the existence of separate fatherlands for hundreds and thousands of years".¹ In it is concentrated all

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 187.

that is progressive and typical in the national democratic traditions of all the nations and nationalities comprising the population of the country: affection for the native land, for the nature known from childhood, for the native language and culture, for the customs of one's people, and national pride in the contribution one's people has made to the democratic culture of the world, in feats of heroism of the past, etc.

But the main content of socialist patriotism, completely different from the old-time patriotism, is loyalty and dedication to the communist cause, to the socialist system, the policy of the Marxist-Leninist Party, all of which assure the country's economic, social, political and cultural progress, at a rate inconceivable under capitalism, in the interests of the whole of society. Hence the affection that the working people of all nations and nationalities display for their common socialist fatherland. Hence their fidelity to the common revolutionary traditions in life and labour.

Pride in the entire multinational Soviet people, which stands in the vanguard of the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism, pride for its internationalist traditions in battle and work, encompasses all that is valuable and implicit in the patriotic feelings of the working people of all nations and nationalities in the country building communism.¹

The essence of socialist patriotism is brought out in the following Lenin's tenets: that the victorious working class defends the socialist fatherland, socialism as a fatherland, and the Soviet republic as a contingent of the world army of socialism, and that it remains loyal to the fraternal alliance of workers of other nations.² This is of tremendous methodological significance, leading up to the important theoretical and practical political conclusion that the main content of socialist patriotism should on no account be obscured by its general-democratic and specific-national traditions.

Unlike the old patriotism, characteristic chiefly of the petty bourgeoisie, a patriotism that contrasted one's people to other peoples, socialist patriotism is essentially internationalist:

¹ See L. I. Brezhnev, *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, p. 78.

² See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 163.

first, its political, economic, social and ideological foundations are international;

second, in every socialist country its bearers are the working people of all nations and nationalities in equal measure;

third, it links the perspectives of its country, nation or nationality with international proletarian solidarity, with the class struggle of the international working class and its allies, with the victory of communism on an international scale;

fourth, in objective content and significance the patriotic activity of the working people of socialist countries is, at the same time, practical performance of their internationalist duty.

This is why socialist patriotism is incompatible with bourgeois chauvinism or nationalism, or petty-bourgeois national narrow-mindedness. It is linked organically with proletarian socialist internationalism. Consequently, its development may proceed in close association with internationalist education.

This organic connection of patriotic and internationalist education is continuously emphasised by the Central Committee of the CPSU, reaffirming its policy of educating the people in the spirit of Soviet patriotism and the spirit of friendship, fraternity and international solidarity with the peoples of the socialist countries, with all peoples fighting for social and national liberation, for democracy, peace and socialism.

"As the Party resolves the problems of the country's further development along the way mapped out by Lenin," L. I. Brezhnev stressed, "it attaches great importance to the continuous, systematic and deep-going education of all Soviet citizens in the spirit of internationalism and Soviet patriotism. For us these two concepts comprise an unbreakable whole."¹ The content of the patriotic-internationalist consciousness depends on objective as well as subjective factors. In the stage of communist construction the following constitute the objective factors:

—creation of the material and technical basis of communism through a rapid development of the productive forces,

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, p. 37.

rapid scientific and technological progress in the entire country, the further balancing of the economic levels of nations and nationalities, consolidation of their economic community, numerical growth of multinational production collectives;

—improvement of social relations, eradication of class and intra-class disparities, extension of the social homogeneity of society, development of socialist democracy, greater active commitment of the working people, their greater sense of responsibility for the socialist country;

—steady drawing together of nations and nationalities within the country and stronger international ties with working people of other countries;

—continued convergence and mutual enrichment of national cultures, gradual internationalisation of the life style, development of new traditions common for people of different nations.

These processes are the basis for the continuously growing friendship and unity of nations and nationalities, the further consolidation of the new historical community of people — the multinational Soviet people — and, consequently, the evolution of a common patriotic-internationalist consciousness.

“The farther we advance in the building of communism, the more multiform and stronger become the economic, cultural and other relations linking all the peoples of the USSR, the stronger and deeper will be the lofty sense of that great community we call the national pride of the Soviet man.”¹

But patriotic and internationalist education also involves a subjective factor — the organisational and ideological work of the Party and other public organisations.

The old-style patriotism was mainly a spontaneous thing which evolved over centuries and millennia for objective reasons. But the internationalist consciousness cannot arise in the same way, purely on the basis of one's personal experiences and natural affection for the native land.

“Internationalist education constitutes one of the central tasks of all Party, Soviet, economic, cultural and public

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, p. 87.

organisations, of all our cadres at the centre and in localities, in each Republic, Territory, Region and in each collective.”¹

As a rule, many people have to do with just a limited round of social phenomena—limited by their age, profession, residence, and the like. They have but few close and direct bonds with other peoples.

On the surface, they may frequently observe temporary inconsistencies between the national interests of different peoples. The liberation movement on the international stage or the consolidation of the world socialist system is not directly perceived by them in terms of such ordinary notions as assistance and support for their socialist country, their nation, as one of the decisive factors of their own welfare. To really understand the community of aims and vital class interests of the working people of the world underlying the multiplicity of events, one must have scientific knowledge and insight.

The ideology of internationalism is developing on the basis of the experience of the world revolutionary process as a whole. Being part of the scientific Marxist-Leninist outlook, it is inculcated in working people by the Communist Party.

But the consolidation of internationalist ideas during the building of socialism does not wholly guarantee against manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism, though these are no longer represented by any definite class or social group. Originating not in the social, but in the individual consciousness, they are impelled mainly by the influence of a “mini-milieu”.

In other words, the nature of the communist formation precludes an objective basis for the survivals of chauvinism and nationalism. In the socialist society, which is the lower phase of communism emerging from the womb of capitalism, these survivals are chiefly a legacy of the exploiting system. The memory of disputes between nations, of territorial conflicts, religious clashes, colonialist policy, suppression of culture or language, and the like, lives on a long time in the consciousness of people.

This is due to the fact, among other things, that under capitalism the bulk of the population of our country and most

¹ *On Preparations for the 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*. Resolution of the CC CPSU, p. 25.

of the other socialist countries, and especially of the peripheral national areas, consisted of non-proletarian strata or those who, due to their economic and social condition, has a stunted idea about the interests of their people and to whom international proletarian solidarity was incomprehensible and foreign.

One cause of chauvinism and nationalism may also for a certain time be traced to the factual inequality of nations, of their economic and cultural levels inherited from capitalism.

The survival, and at times a certain invigoration, of nationalism are also due to subjective causes — an insufficiently full appreciation of the objective social laws during the building of the new society, certain subjectivistic violations of the principles of Leninist national policy, and flaws in the organisational and ideological work of government and Party organs.

Survivals of chauvinism come into evidence in the bureaucratic neglect of the specific interests of other nations and nationalities, in bureaucratic disrespect towards their language, customs, and culture.

Among the manifestations of nationalism are national egoism, parochialism, national arrogance and conceit displayed in connection with the nation's achievements belittling the other peoples' contribution to science and culture, dislike of the common language adopted by the nations, contempt for the advanced experience of fraternal republics, national careerism, attempts to restrict the influx of population from other republics on the pretext of protecting the "national identity", idealisation of the nation's history, preservation of outdated national traditions, etc.

Nationalism is dangerous because it speculates on national feelings. Its exponents parade as patriots, as the true champions of national interests, while portraying internationalism as a negative attitude to the interests of the nation or nationality. This is why nationalism is liable to poison the consciousness of some working people.

Manifestations of chauvinism, nationalism and national exclusiveness are overcome by the continuous improvement of the socialist system and more intensive ideological work, intensive internationalist education, cultivation of the ideas of

socialist patriotism. This has become particularly necessary due to the intensification of the ideological struggle between socialism and capitalism on the international scale. Seeing that its attempts to "roll back" socialism by military, political and economic means have failed, imperialist reaction is trying to disrupt the unity of the world liberation movement and the socialist camp, and the friendship of the peoples within the socialist countries, by bourgeois nationalist propaganda. Anti-communists maintain that antagonisms in national relations are natural and everlasting. The abominations typical of capitalism, they aver, also apply to socialist reality. They deny or belittle socialism's resolution of the national question. For example, they equate the internationalist policy of the CPSU, its orientation on drawing the nations together, with the colonialist and Russifying policy of the tsarist times. And the Communist Party's efforts to eliminate survivals of nationalism in the consciousness of some Soviet people are portrayed as a policy of liquidating national characteristics.

The anti-communist slander is backed up by revisionist and dogmatist nationalist conceptions.

This makes it necessary to invigorate communist, and particularly internationalist, education. In the conditions of socialism and communist construction, the CPSU Programme stresses, it is of paramount importance to mould the scientific world outlook of the working people on the basis of Marxism-Leninism as an integral and clear system of philosophical, economic and social-political views.¹

2. THE MAIN TRENDS IN INTERNATIONALIST EDUCATION

The success of internationalist education depends on how fully it reflects—in keeping with Marxist-Leninist theory—the objective laws of social development in the epoch of transition from capitalism to communism, and particularly the objective socialist tendencies in national relations. These objective laws determine the specific tasks and basic trends of internationalist education.

¹ See *The Road to Communism*, p. 563.

Internationalist, and at the same time patriotic, education works in the basic interest of the international working class and its ultimate aim — the worldwide victory of communism. It brings home to the working people of different nationalities their kinship with their own people, the community of peoples building communist society, and the great international proletarian army of fighters for peace, democracy and socialism. They learn of the historical role played by their country, their nation, in the world revolutionary process.

The purpose of internationalist education is to forge convictions and motivate a readiness to be an internationalist in word and deed, because real proletarian internationalism is not mere expression of sentiment, but is displayed in actions, that is, in the unfailing performance of its international duty by each people, collective, and individual.

To perform one's internationalist duty is, firstly, to work for the fulfilment by one's country, one's republic, of the common tasks of socialist and communist construction, thereby promoting the world revolutionary process and aligning one's activity with the common aim of the international working class, and, second, to make sacrifices if and when necessary for the common aim, assisting the working people of other countries, and defending the world socialist system, the product of the international working class.

To appreciate one's internationalist duty one must know the vital interests of the international working class and appreciate their priority in relation to the interests of individual countries and nations. Also, one must know the part played by one's people in the world liberation movement. It is most important to show the identity of the interests of the working people in the country, irrespective of their nationality, and the terms on which each nation, nationality and the whole Soviet people can achieve further progress.

Defining the main trends of internationalist education, it is essential, first of all, to analyse its fundamental principle in terms of the method and class essence of scientific communism. This means showing the content of the vital class interests common to the working class of all countries and nations, the content of the ultimate goal — liberation of working people from capitalist oppression, and building socialism and com-

munism; showing that the interests of the socialist world revolution go before local, national interests. Lenin provided the following model for propagating proletarian internationalism. "To be an internationalist...", he said, "one must *not* think only of one's own nation, but place *above it* the interests of all nations, their common liberty and equality."¹

In the final analysis, the destiny of every nation, its social progress and sovereignty, depend on the world correlation of class forces, on the outcome of the struggle between socialism and capitalism, the strength, scale and unity of all the revolutionary forces of our time, and not only on the successes of socialist and communist construction in one's own country.

Differentiating working people by nationality, race, religion or territory tends to divide the forces of the world liberation movement and, consequently, weaken the positions of every nation in its struggle to consolidate national sovereignty and for economic, social-political and cultural progress.

The prime objective of internationalist education is to show the masses the place and role of their country, their nation, in the world liberation movement, to show them the content of its international functions and rally them to perform these functions. The awareness that the Soviet Union, the mightiest of the socialist countries, stands in the vanguard of the world liberation movement adds to the sense of responsibility of every Soviet citizen, irrespective of nationality, for his daily work and participation in communist construction, in the common struggle for the victory of the socialist world revolution.

For every socialist country to perform its role in the world liberation movement, the working people of all nations and nationalities within its borders must concentrate all their efforts. This is particularly important in the case of multinational countries, such as the Soviet Union.

It is therefore necessary to show the identity of the basic interests of all nations and nationalities in every socialist country and in the socialist system as a whole. For the peoples of the USSR this identity of interests is reflected in overthrowing the landowners and capitalists of the former Russian

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 347.

empire and establishing the proletarian dictatorship, defeating the counter-revolution and the foreign armed intervention, launching socialist industrialisation, cooperation in agriculture, and the cultural revolution, making the fullest possible use of the historic advantages of socialism over capitalism, working for a living standard higher than in capitalist countries, assuring joint defence of the fatherland, augmenting its defensive capacity, assisting peoples fighting against imperialism, and building communist society.

Knowledge of the identity of their basic interests by the Soviet people assures the correct correlation of these interests with the interests of every separate nation and nationality. Then the working people understand more deeply that joint fulfilment of the common tasks—particularly augmenting the country's economic and defensive strength—guarantees the genuine sovereignty of every separate nation and nationality, its interests, growth of its creative powers, and its individuality. Conversely, contrasting the interests of different nations creates division among the peoples of the united socialist state.

Those who place the interests of their nation above the interests of the Soviet people as a whole, weaken socialism's positions and undermine the most important foundation for the development of their own nation.

It should be shown as part of internationalist education that the unity of national and international interests implicit in the socialist system, does not come about automatically. The difficulties in achieving it stem from differences in the economic and cultural levels of nations, their geography and size of population, and the lingering influence of conflicts that had occurred between them prior to the victory of socialism.

The objective foundations for the relations between the nations and nationalities develop continuously: the economy and culture rise all the time, and social relations are improved in every republic and the country as a whole. These changes in the material basis are reflected in the subjective side of national relations, particularly the practical work of internationalist education—its concrete content, main trends, and also forms and means.

As we have said, the victorious proletarian revolution gives rise to two objectively interconnected tendencies in the

development of nations and national relations. But at every stage of socialist and communist construction the interaction of these two tendencies is specific.

For this reason, the system of internationalist education should at every stage reflect this concrete feature and account for the continuously developing objective tendencies, and orient itself on the perspectives of their development in the immediate and more distant future, on the process of the convergence of nations, and their complete fusion after the victory of communism on an international scale. Increasing attention should also be paid in the present stage to the effects of the ever more intensive internationalisation of the mode of life of all peoples.¹

This is most important in bringing home the continuously growing community of interests of working people of different nations and nationalities.

The present scientific and technological revolution does not fit into the framework of any separate nation or nationality, and not even that of large multinational states. The growth of the productive forces requires concerted efforts on an international scale. Even in the setting of private enterprise bourgeois governments are compelled to "integrate" the production of different countries. And socialism creates much more favourable conditions for this, and a much broader basis. That is one of its major advantages over capitalism, guaranteeing its worldwide victory.

Obviously, internationalist education must not ignore or belittle the specifically national in the life of the peoples. The slightest transgression would go counter to the objective laws of socialism, the development of nations and relations between nations.

Internationalisation is impelled by the growth of the productive forces and the relations of production. But it is inconceivable without the growth of the national and its use for common international purposes. Disappearance of the national would mean withering away of nations and, consequently, the culmination of the process of internationalisation. But the natural extension and deepening of economic and cultural ties

¹ *On Preparations for the 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*. Resolution of the CC CPSU, p. 17.

between the world's various economic and geographic regions will not, for many years to come, signify the disappearance of national distinctions.

Socialism quickens the process of internationalisation much more than capitalism precisely because it rules out coercion of nations and nationalities, and assures their equality, freedom and the right to self-determination. This is the only possible way to overcome suspicion and hostility, and secure the convergence and, in the more remote future, the fusion of nations.

The more deeply and fully every nation develops its material and spiritual resources and the greater is its contribution to the common international objectives, the more intensive is the process of internationalisation.¹

The working people's concern for the advancement of the entire socialist fatherland is displayed in their practical participation in the development of their respective nation or republic in harmony with the basic state interests common to all the peoples of the country.

This is why in moulding socialist patriotism in combination with internationalist education we must show the interconnection and correlation of the international and national, the influence of the international on the evolution of the national.

The methodological guidelines for internationalist and, likewise, patriotic education of working people are contained in Lenin's following proposition: "We want a *voluntary* union of nations—a union which precludes any coercion of one nation by another—a union founded on complete confidence, on a clear recognition of brotherly unity, on absolutely voluntary consent. Such a union cannot be effected at one stroke; we have to work toward it with the greatest patience and circumspection, so as not to spoil matters and not to arouse distrust, and so that the distrust inherited from centuries of landowner and capitalist oppression, centuries of private property and the enmity caused by its divisions and redivisions may have a chance to wear off."²

¹ See L. I. Brezhnev, *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, p. 30.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 293.

The following main conclusions may be drawn from this and other of Lenin's tenets concerning the education of working people in a spirit of harmony between socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism.

To be successful, such education must provide a scientific understanding of the principal aspects in the policy of the working class and its Party on the national question: uniting the working people irrespective of their nationality for the common struggle against social and national oppression, and for the victory of socialism and communism.

Another no less important requisite is to explain that the historical mission of the working class, its international unity, class solidarity, and alliance with the labouring masses of all the peoples of the country, is one of the vital sources of victory in the socialist revolution, in building socialism and communism. It is important to show the objective tendencies in the relations between nations, in the convergence of nations and nationalities under socialism, and the perspective of their ultimate fusion after the victory of communism on the international scale.

To produce a fuller picture of the historic successes of socialism in resolving the national question, it is necessary to take into account the consequences of tsarism's colonialist policy, which intensively cultivated national strife. To belittle or ignore these consequences is the same as belittling socialism's role in resolving the most complicated problems created and left behind by the exploitation system—problems that capitalism cannot solve.

Not only does socialism inherit, but also develops the democratic traditions of friendship and fraternity among different peoples, and their economic and cultural ties that evolved despite tsarism's colonialist policy. It is highly important, too, to examine the common revolutionary and militant traditions of the working class, the working people of all nationalities, shaped in the joint struggle against tsarism and capitalism, against internal and external enemies.

When demonstrating the historical advantages of socialism in solving the national question, and the significance of the

equality of nations it guarantees and the principle of free will implicit in their union, it is also necessary to stress that the slightest violation of these principles, the slightest attempt to push the convergence and fusion of nations, is bound to be counter-productive, retarding the process and reviving the old distrust, alienation and hostility.

Any real analysis of the principle of free will should include an exposition of the need for union. In socialist conditions, where national oppression no longer exists, large states (as well as inter-state economic associations) have incontestable advantages over smaller states in respect to economic development, and the scientific and technological progress and cultural advancement of all nations and nationalities. As part of a large state, every nation and nationality irrespective of its size, area, and level of development will make far greater progress in all fields than as a separate, independent state. The formation and growth of the Soviet Union augmented the forces and resources of the peoples in building socialism. Socialism's historical superiority, which assures the development of every nation, comes into play more fully in a bigger state or inter-state association, given the closest cooperation of the peoples. For its advantages to be optimally effective the victory must be on an international scale. This is why all attempts to go it alone and to build socialism in isolation are tantamount, in effect, to denying one's people a substantial portion of the tremendous possibilities that socialism offers for the growth of the productive forces, the flowering of culture and the highest possible standard of living. All separatism is, therefore, not only anti-internationalist, but in substance also anti-national.

The internationalist objective of the convergence and fusion of nations implies most tactful and considerate responses to national interests, national feelings and customs, to all the specifically national in the culture, life style and psychology of the nation. Bureaucratic neglect of local interests is not to be tolerated. Leninism, however, rules out the supra-class, non-historical approach, and teaches us to combat the fetishism of archaic customs and rites, survivals of a backward life style, and national exclusiveness. It prescribes consistent

support of everything progressive, everything that helps eradicate national disparities.¹

While encouraging affection for one's native language, Communists criticise artificial barriers to learning and using the country's common language of communication. The patriot and internationalist, they show, would never want to conserve national isolation in defiance of the objective and worldwide process of internationalisation.

Lenin and the Communist Party have always combated chauvinism and nihilistic neglect of national feelings, but they also combated nationalist exaggeration of national feelings.

Explaining the principle of the equality of nations and nationalities, Lenin and the Party showed that proletarian internationalism amounted to much more than mere equality. Its most important element is united action by working people of different nationalities in the struggle for the common aim—the building of socialism and communism.

Working in the interest of the international working class and its allies, proletarian and socialist internationalism relies on all the democratic traditions of struggle against social and national oppression. This is why the freedom and equality of all nations is one of its basic principles. But the exercise of this principle depends on successful joint struggle by the working people of the world, and also every nation and country, against capitalism and for the building of socialist and communist society.

Correct selection of the main directions in keeping with Lenin's precepts and the immediate tasks of communist construction is crucial for successful education in the spirit of socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism. This guarantees the loyalty of working people of all nationalities to the cause of the Communist Party and the socialist system, the basis for solving social and national problems in the interests of the people, for the rapid progress of the country as a whole and of every nation and nationality. It assures an understanding of, and the correct, realistic approach to, the immediate and long-term objectives of communist construction.

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, pp. 35-36.

The Communist Party provides a scientific understanding of the significance of the friendship and unity of all the peoples of the Soviet socialist state, and of the real economic, political and cultural uplift of every nation and nationality. It brings home to the working people that the state of the economy of the individual republics and regions depends on the rising effectiveness of the country's economy as a whole; their success is the work of the entire Soviet people.

The crucial direction in patriotic-internationalist education, therefore, is to cultivate affection and devotion to the multinational socialist country—and pride in the Soviet land—among the working people of all nations and nationalities of the USSR.

An important objective of patriotic-internationalist education is to eradicate any remnants of chauvinism and nationalism that may surface in the present stage of communist construction.

Success is assured first and foremost by such objective factors as the growth of democratic and socialist forces throughout the world, the further more conclusive assertion of socialism's historical advantages over capitalism in resolving the most complex of social and national problems, and the new advances towards a real and factual equality of nations.

Party experience in the Soviet republics shows that success in combating nationalism is assured by:

- propaganda of the principles of proletarian internationalism and elucidation of the national policy of the Communist Party;

- systematic and consistent struggle against all survivals of the past: self-seeking proprietary motivations, moral instability, and religious and other prejudices often leading to manifestations of nationalism;

- exhaustive explication of the objective and subjective causes of nationalism, which stem from bygone times and from the difficulties of socialist and communist construction;

- concrete exposure of every manifestation of nationalism, and of its bearers;

- exposition of the anti-democratic, anti-socialist and anti-national essence of the survivals of nationalism, and of

their objective similarity to imperialist acts of ideological subversion;

— criticism of various manifestations of nationalism first and foremost among members of one's own nation, and exposure of émigré bourgeois nationalists.

Manifestations of nationalism and national narrow-mindedness are largely nourished by the imperialists' nationalist propaganda beamed to the socialist countries. Hence, to be successful internationalist education must expose the ideology of anti-communism and the bourgeois falsehoods about national relations in socialist countries.

Lenin's theoretical and political activity has taught the Communist and Workers' parties to be consistent, persevering and unrelenting in fighting the ideology of bourgeois nationalism and cosmopolitanism. He exposed the reactionary designs of world imperialism to split the international working class by implanting nationalism among the exploited and oppressed masses.

By fanning chauvinism and nationalism the imperialist bourgeoisie managed to divide and weaken the international working class, destroy the Second International, which was bedevilled by opportunism, and start the imperialist First World War, sending workers of different countries into the field to slaughter each other.

And it was similar nationalist tools that rabidly reactionary imperialist militarist groups used to plunge humanity into the Second World War.

Mindful of Lenin's precepts, the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties call attention to the present dangers of nationalism for the world socialist system and the entire international liberation movement. World reaction is banking on nationalism and "national communism" to detach countries from the socialist system one by one. The 1956 events in Hungary and of 1968 in Czechoslovakia were clear evidence of the menace of nationalism and anti-Sovietism, assiduously cultivated by imperialist propaganda.

And it is one of the main objectives of the working people's education in the spirit of proletarian internationalism and socialist patriotism as a harmonious unity, to expose imperialist

designs, to show the real meaning of bourgeois nationalist theories, their anti-socialist and anti-Soviet orientation.

No less important is it to criticise the nationalist concepts of present-day revisionism and dogmatism. Lenin's theoretical legacy is a dependable guide to assuring the purity of Marxist-Leninist theory and combating nationalist distortions of it by Right and "Left" opportunists.

The process of overcoming remnants of chauvinism and nationalism, and internationalist education as a whole, encompass not only relations between nations and nationalities, but also those between individuals of different nationalities. In other words, they apply not only to the political and ideological, but also to the moral and ethical spheres. Continuous and hard work is required to assure the development of the political and ideological principles of proletarian internationalism into deep-rooted convictions and standards of behaviour for all Soviet people, especially the rising generation.

Patriotic and internationalist education forges such moral principles as humanism, idealism, and a sense of justice, collectivism and duty. Special importance attaches to the propaganda of atheism, because religious survivals are all too frequently used as the outer wrapping of bourgeois nationalism.

Internationalist and patriotic education is closely linked with the basic objectives of communist construction and the consolidation of the world liberation movement.

3. THE SPECIFIC FEATURES OF NATIONS, CLASSES AND SOCIAL GROUPS AND THEIR BEARING ON INTERNATIONALIST EDUCATION

Lenin taught the Communist and Workers' parties to take into account the specific quality of the relations between the former oppressor and oppressed nations in order to assure unity in the course of socialist construction. In internationalist education Communists of former oppressor nations must emphasise all the progressive elements contained in the specifically national of every nation and nationality, focus attention on the significance of self-determination, on the

struggle against remnants of great-power chauvinism, and stress respect for the national interests, customs, language and feelings of formerly oppressed peoples.

While showing the vanguard role of the great Russian people in establishing and consolidating the socialist fatherland and in promoting the world liberation movement, Lenin and the Communist Party did not ascribe to it any special and ideal qualities, and showed that its role derives from the "intertwin-ing" of external and internal factors and the operation of the development laws of the socialist revolution in Russia and the rest of the world. They always gave credit to all the other peoples for their contribution to the revolutionary movement, to socialist and communist construction.

Communists of formerly oppressed nations, on the other hand, should concentrate attention on the significance of the assistance received from the more developed nations, on the need for closer cooperation, which benefits the country as a whole and every nation in particular, and on combating the survivals of local nationalism. The Communists of the formerly backward peoples of Russia, for example, described the part played by the Russian people in preparing and performing the socialist revolution, creating and developing the Soviet state, building socialism and communism, augmenting the economic power and defensive capacity of the socialist fatherland, and showed the advantages of learning the Russian language, which provides access to the achievements of Soviet and world culture, science and technology.

The following factors must be taken into account in the differentiated approach to the internationalist education of working people:

- the concrete distinctive features in the formation and development of every nation (nationality) and in its passage to socialism;
- the strength of national consciousness and the inter-nationalist world outlook;
- the nature of the legacy of the tsarist and capitalist era;
- the special features of the class structure and, particular-ly, the correlation of the urban and rural population;
- the share of the nation in the population of the republic;
- the extent of traditional ties with other peoples;

— the existence of chauvinist and nationalist survivals in the consciousness of some part of the population.

For internationalist education to be effective, it should fit the concrete situation deriving from the specific historical development of the nation, its class structure, and the ethnic processes in the life of the Soviet republics, regions, and even individual working collectives.

The Marxist-Leninist class approach also requires us to consider the social background: workers, farmers and intellectuals differ from each other in position, their part in the communist reconstruction of society and in consolidating and developing the socialist fatherland.

The system of means and methods of internationalist education is determined by the following distinctive features of the working class as the leading force of socialist society:

- its direct association with the single countrywide form of state ownership (ownership of the whole people) of which the entire Soviet people is the subject;

- its participation in large-scale industrial production, which is of the same type in all Soviet republics;

- its concentration chiefly in the big industrial and cultural centres;

- its high level of political and cultural development, organisation and discipline, conditioned by modern industrial production;

- the multinational (as a rule) composition of workers' collectives;

- its rich internationalist traditions in revolutionary struggle and in labour;

- its extensive industrial and cultural ties with workers' collectives in other Union republics, other socialist countries, and the developing states;

- the continuous growth of its share in the population due to the influx of young people and people from rural areas;

- its special responsibility for the socialist fatherland, the world socialist system, and the entire world liberation movement.

The means and methods of the workers' internationalist education are continuously improved under the Party's guidance in keeping with the priorities of socialist construction,

the development of the world liberation movement, and the changes in the working class impelled by its continuously rising cultural and technical level.

The differentiated approach to internationalist education must also take stock of the farmers' objective condition:

- they are directly associated with the group, cooperative, collective-farm type of ownership, an ownership of only members of cooperatives, not of the entire Soviet people;

- the specific trend in farming depends on the natural and climatic conditions, which differ depending on the region of the country;

- farmers are mainly dispersed in villages at considerable distances from each other and from the big industrial and cultural centres;

- compared with the working class, peasants have a lower level of political and cultural knowledge, and are less organised;

- the farmers' labour collectives are as a rule of one nationality and their association with members of other nationalities is not intensive;

- farmers have fewer ties with labour collectives in other republics, other socialist countries, or developing countries;

- due to their former petty-bourgeois status, peasants are more hardened bearers of proprietary and religious survivals, and also survivals of national exclusiveness.

The specific features of the intelligentsia, its role in the progress of the nation, and the reasons why backward sentiments surface among some of its members, are also taken into account by Party and public organisations conducting internationalist education.

The patriotic-internationalist education of working people is complicated by the fact that the special objective condition of workers, farmers and intellectuals is only indirectly reflected in each concrete situation. The general tendency in moulding the socialist consciousness of a class or social stratum does not rule out individual deviations.

Internationalist education hinges on the treatment of the specific features of nations as a whole, the objective situation of the working class, the farmers and the intelligentsia. But it also hinges on the treatment of the social-national specific features

of various groups—groups in production and professional groups, groups with a similar educational level, residential groups, and the like. Especially important is a scientifically sound system of internationalist education for young workers and students of schools and universities.

Party, trade-union and Komsomol (Young Communist League) organisations concentrate attention on the internationalist education of working people directly on the job. To make it more effective they align it with the national background of workers and employees, the relations between ethnic groups, and their friendly ties.

Lenin and the Communist Party never made a fetish of specific methods and forms of educational work. They warned against uniformity in the approach to the different categories of working people. They emphasised thorough study of practical experience and encouraged the search for new, better and more effective means of communist education.

Favourable opportunities have been forged in the course of socialist and communist construction for promoting the spirit of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism. The Communist Party has at its disposal such powerful ideological and moral media as the press, radio, television, cinema and theatre.

Always, the Communist Party emphasises the imperative of cultivating Soviet patriotism among all working people, primarily the rising generation, pride for the socialist Motherland, for the great achievements of the Soviet people, in the spirit of internationalism and intolerance of all manifestations of nationalism, chauvinism and national exclusiveness, in the spirit of respect for all nations and nationalities.

Party organisations have extensive practical experience in patriotic and internationalist education. The fraternal friendship of working people of different nationalities is forged and strengthened chiefly by joint labour in the same shop, team or shift. Multinational industrial enterprises like the Kazakhstan Iron-and-Steel Works (known as Kazakh Magnitogorsk'), whose many thousands of workers include people of 46 nationalities, have become real centres of internationalist education.

There are various forms of socialist emulation between the

Union republics, between regions, towns, districts and factory collectives.

The system of political education, particularly study of the theory and practice of proletarian internationalism, the friendship of the peoples of the USSR and Lenin's national policy, plays an important part in moulding the patriotic and internationalist outlook of working people.

Friendship festivals, excursions to fraternal republics, guest performances by theatre companies, art and literature festivals, translations of the fiction of fraternal peoples, and exhibitions of achievements of other republics, are highly popular. Rallies and meetings on holidays of Union republics and peoples of other socialist countries are also an effective form of education. And international friendship clubs are popular among young people.

Good results have also been achieved by the extensive network of schools for children of different nationalities, international pen clubs, popularisation of the all-Soviet traditions and life style, etc.

Many Party organisations introduce novel elements into the already existing forms of educational work, heightening people's interest. Also, they study the practical effect, political response and emotional impact of patriotic and internationalist education by means of sociological investigations, public opinion polls and progress reports.

Various aspects of educational work blending Soviet patriotism with proletarian internationalism, are discussed at meetings of Party committees in towns and districts, and of many Party branches.

Questions relating to Soviet patriotism, internationalism and the friendship of the peoples are dealt with extensively by the central and republican press. The content of the patriotic and internationalist duty of the Soviet people as a whole and the people of every constituent and autonomous republic is dealt with in more specific terms.

The celebration of the centenary of V. I. Lenin's birth and of the 50th anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics exercised a beneficial influence on the patriotic-internationalist outlook of the people. Soviet people acquired a deeper appreciation of the practical implementation of Lenin's ideas

in the building of communist society, of the significance of internationalism and the friendship of the peoples for the further development of the multinational socialist state, and of the role of the Soviet Union in the world revolutionary process.

However, there are still some considerable deficiencies in patriotic and internationalist education. The work of Party organisations in this important field is not as systematic as it should be, and lacks the necessary degree of planning and sense of purpose. Not always are the social-national features of population groups taken into account, and the variety of forms and means of educational work is not always fully used. The system of Party and Komsomol education does not always provide deep enough instruction in Lenin's ideological legacy on the national question and the internationalist traditions of the CPSU and the world communist movement, the history of struggle against nationalist deviations, on the objective laws governing relations between nations under socialism and communism, and on forms and methods of struggle against anti-communism and anti-Sovietism.

Cultivating the conscious loyalty to their united socialist country of all working people irrespective of nationality is essential for the growth of its might, for its rising prestige and greater influence on world events.

More effective internationalist education is necessitated by the vital objective of further consolidating the unity of the world socialist system and the entire international working-class and communist movement, by the greater role of the national question in the world revolutionary process, and by the need to resolve the vitally important problems of the present epoch of transition from capitalism to communism.

This is greatly aided by the scientifically elaborated policy of the Communist Party in all spheres of society, including relations between nations and nationalities, the rectification of mistakes connected with the personality cult and subjectivism, and the improvement of all organisational and ideological work.

CHAPTER NINE

THE SOVIET PEOPLE—A NEW HISTORICAL COMMUNITY

The development of the nations and nationalities of the USSR along socialist lines was crowned by the emergence of a new social-political and international community—the Soviet people. This was the natural result of the effectuation of the great ideals of the October Revolution, the socialist reconstruction of the economy, elimination of the exploiting classes, invigoration of the alliance of workers, collective farmers and the intelligentsia, and the making, development and gradual convergence of socialist nations.

Under the guidance of Lenin's Party, defying extreme hardships, the Soviet nations and nationalities were the first to win genuine freedom, to become full masters in their country, and to build the world's first developed socialist society, merging gradually into a single Soviet people.

Economic, social, political, moral and aesthetic life in the Soviet Union reposes on the friendship and brotherhood of the working people of all the country's nationalities. The Soviet people is a close-knit collective of urban and rural working people. Also, it is a single and friendly family of more than 100 nationalities jointly building communism. Progressives all over the world recognise that the Soviet people is succeeding in its world-historical mission of scout and pioneer of humanity's communist future.

"We have always started from the premise," says the CPSU Central Committee Report to the 25th Congress, "that we now have a fully shaped new historical community, the Soviet people, which is based on the solid alliance of the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia, with the working class

playing the leading role, and on the friendship of all the big and small nations of our country.”¹

The summary product of all the interconnected economic and social-political changes in our country over the past half century, the Soviet people as a new and higher type of historical community will unquestionably play an ever greater role in the building of communism, in the progress of society.

1. SOCIAL AND INTERNATIONAL UNITY OF NATIONS AND NATIONALITIES—AN IMPORTANT OBJECTIVE LAW OF SOCIALIST SOCIETY

History has seen various types of community—the clan, tribe, nationality and nation. The Soviet people is a fundamentally new *social* and *international* community of people.

The clan and tribe reposed on common ancestry and were a “natural community” in which, as Marx and Engels noted, people were indistinguishable from each other and had not yet separated from the umbilical cord of primitive community. The development of private property, exchange and trade destroyed the tribal bonds, and caused stratification into classes. On this basis there emerged nationalities, whose main quality was not collectiveness but the isolation and estrangement of different classes and social groups, and also the isolation of regions. As the social antagonisms mounted, the dominant classes began to hold up the progressive development of the people. By so doing, they lost contact with them. During this period the concept “people” meant only the working masses. The same is observed in the case of nations when the interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie become polarised.

In an antagonistic society, especially a multinational state like tsarist Russia, the concept “people” does not encompass the entire nation.

The opportunist wing of the Social-Democrats of Western Europe and the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks of Russia followed in the footsteps of bourgeois ideologists and concealed the class division of society behind the concept “people”, portrayed by them as a homogeneous mass. The

¹ *Report of the CPSU Central Committee and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy*, 25th Congress of the CPSU, Moscow, 1976, p. 96.

present-day social-reformists and revisionists, who claim that in capitalist countries the people is a single body, follow the same line in the discourse on national unity. The founders of Marxism-Leninism have always firmly opposed this opportunist and philistine dissemblance of class distinctions. Class antagonisms also give rise to antagonisms between peoples.

The abolition of capitalist private property, first effected in the Soviet country, did away not only with the exploitation of man by man, but also with the oppression of people by people, paving the way thereby for the emergence of the single international family of the peoples of the USSR.

The new historical community—the Soviet people, took shape chiefly as a result of the changes in the class structure of society. In 1913, the population of tsarist Russia consisted of 16.3 per cent of bourgeois, landowners, traders and kulaks, 17 per cent of workers and other employees (14 per cent were workers) and 66.7 per cent of peasants and artisans. In contrast, Soviet society consists of working people only. Nearly 83 per cent are workers and other employees of socialist enterprises and offices (60.9 per cent are workers), and 17.1 per cent are collective farmers.

The abolition of the exploiting classes eliminated the main organisers not only of class oppression, but also of national oppression, national strife, alienation and suspicion. And the collectivisation of the peasantry put an end to the petty-bourgeois source of national isolation. The evolution of a socialist intelligentsia, too, helped overcome national narrow-mindedness. The friendly classes and groups in Soviet socialist society are drawing closer and closer together, the social-political and ideological unity of the entire people is growing stronger. The working class, the main productive force of society and the most progressive class of this epoch, stands at the centre of these processes. Taking the lead from the working class, the collective farmers and the Soviet intelligentsia have acquired and are developing many of its features—political activeness and consciousness, sense of discipline and organisation, and collectivism. At the same time, in the setting of rapid scientific and technological progress workers and farmers are moving ever closer to the mental workers, the intelligentsia.

The building of socialism in the Soviet Union has confirmed the Marxist-Leninist postulate that elimination of duality in national life and of antagonisms between nations is possible only after the abolition of the exploiting classes, the drawing labouring classes and social groups closer under the leadership of the working class, and the conversion on this basis of nations and nationalities into socialist nations and nationalities.

The national form of society continues under socialism as well, but the transition from capitalism to socialism radically alters the social essence of nations and national relations. Lenin wrote as far back as 1914: "It is impossible to go over from capitalism to socialism without breaking up the national framework, just as it was impossible to pass from feudalism to capitalism without national ideas."¹

Of course, by "breaking up the national framework" Lenin did not mean any final disappearance of national distinctions. That will not be possible until we come to the stage of mature communism. What he meant was that all the economic, political and spiritual life of mankind, which becomes more and more internationalised already under capitalism, will be totally internationalised under socialism.²

It is the establishment of genuine economic community, of the unity of the interests of working people of every nation and the country as a whole, and first and foremost of the working class, that is the basis for the development of nations and nationalities along socialist lines, and for their social-political and ideological unity. And the economic and social-political community of the socialist nations is the basis for the development of the international features of their character, for the growth of their spiritual community, for the continued mutual enrichment and convergence of the national cultures.

The revolutionary social-economic, political and cultural changes produce a socialist national self-awareness, a socialist mentality and behaviour, which come under the continuously growing influence of Marxism-Leninism. The transformation of the nations of bourgeois society into socialist nations is part of the world revolutionary process in the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. This is why the essence of the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 36, p. 302.

² See *ibid.*, Vol. 19, p. 246.

socialist nation transcends the narrow national framework. The socialist nation possesses broad and deep international ties with other nations of socialist countries, with socialism's worldwide class struggle against capitalism. On the basis of socialist internationalism the socialist system provides all the necessary conditions for the fraternal cooperation, mutual assistance and mutual enrichment of all socialist nations. This is an important feature, the starting point for the historically inevitable and necessary emergence and development of new international communities.

The Soviet people have one socialist fatherland. Public ownership of the means of production and the socialist economic system are the material basis for the development of the social-political and international unity of the peoples of the USSR. And the socialist state of the whole people is the new historical community's political foundation. The Soviet people takes guidance in the single Marxist-Leninist ideology. In contrast to bourgeois ideology, which divides the races, nations and nationalities, Marxism-Leninism expresses their common international, as well as their vital, specifically national, interests.

Soviet experience shows that socialist nations advance inevitably to complete unity, forming a new multinational community of a higher order. Such radical transformations as the country's industrialisation, the collectivisation of agriculture, the cultural revolution, the solution of the national question, the consolidation of the alliance of the working class, working peasants and people's intelligentsia, the gradual elimination of the antithesis between town and village and between mental and physical labour, served as the foundation for the emergence of the Soviet people as a new historical community. The friendship and moral-political unity of the peoples, Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism have triumphed. They are a major driving force behind the development of Soviet socialist society.

Following the victory of socialist relations of production and the construction of the material and technical foundation of socialism, Soviet society lost the features of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, and by the mid-nineteen thirties began to function on its own basis. At this

stage the Soviet peoples under the leadership of the Communist Party consolidated socialist society and reinforced the country's defensive capacity, fought for victory in the Great Patriotic War, rehabilitated and extended the economy after the war, and worked for the further development of socialist society in the framework of the world socialist system. In the struggle for these objectives, common to all the nations and nationalities of the USSR, the common features of the Soviet people took root as a new historical community of people, as a new quality in the relations between nations under socialism. At this stage the unity of the economic, social, political and cultural life of all the peoples of the country became a self-evident fact. Marxist-Leninist ideology became the common ideology of all the social classes and groups, and of members of all the nations and nationalities of the USSR, and the interests and ideals of the working class, the leading social force, became the common interests and ideals of all classes and social groups, all nations and nationalities. Thus, the formation of the Soviet people as a new historical community is one of the main results of the joint building of socialist society by the peoples of the USSR.

The *Soviet people* is a new historical, social and international community of people with the fatherland, one territory and one economy, with one culture socialist in content, a federative state of the whole people, and the common aim of building communism. It came into being as a result of socialist transformations and of the convergence of the labouring classes and strata, nations and nationalities.

The socialist social system has given rise to a new psychology, a new spiritual identity. The subject of all economic, political and other social relations—the Soviet people are guided by Marxism-Leninism, the communist ideals of the working class, and the principles of proletarian, socialist internationalism. Russian is the common language of communication between nations, and the range of its social functions and its sphere of application are growing continuously.

The leading role in shaping the new historical community of people—the Soviet people—belongs to the CPSU, which has been multinational in composition and profoundly internationalist in essence from its foundation. "To dispel any idea

of its being national in character," Lenin wrote in 1905, "the Party called itself '*Rossiiskaya*' and not '*Russkaya*'" (the adj. "*Rossiiskaya*"—Russian—pertains to Russia as a country, while "*Russkaya*"—Russian—pertains to nationality—*Tr.*).¹ The Party's direction of the socialist revolution and the building of socialism and communism, and the ideological defeat it inflicted on all anti-Leninist groups and various opportunist and nationalist deviations, secured fraternal cooperation of workers, peasants and the intelligentsia. The international unity of the Party personifies the unity of the Soviet people. Joined in its ranks are the most advanced members of the friendly classes and groups, nations and nationalities. As a result, the CPSU expresses the vital interests and revolutionary will of the entire Soviet people. As a party of scientific communism, with its members forming the leading nucleus in all public and state organisations, it organises and directs the activity of the people, educates them in the spirit of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism, and cements the community of Soviet people in all spheres.

2. THE SOVIET PEOPLE AT THE PRESENT STAGE

In the USSR, developed socialist society is an accomplished fact. In the conditions of mature socialism, the Soviet people has entered a new stage of development. The growth of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people is expressive of the ever greater unity and friendship of all classes and social groups, nations and nationalities, which added to the social homogeneity of Soviet society. The Soviet people, its social-economic, politico-ideological and international unity, represent a higher stage of the worker-peasant alliance, the friendship of the two classes and the socialist intelligentsia, the friendship and brotherhood of all the Soviet nations and nationalities. And the Communist Party is the moving spirit of this unity. In the developed socialist society, socialist internationalism has become the universal expression of class-oriented proletarian internationalism. This means that not only the relations of the workers of different nations and nationalities, but also those of the peasants and intelligentsia,

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, p. 496.

and of the political formations from union and autonomous republics down to autonomous regions and national areas, now repose on internationalism. Socialist internationalism is, therefore, an expression and further development of proletarian internationalism, which is enriched with a new social-political content. Socialist internationalism governs relations between nations, relations that shape and develop in the society of victorious socialism on the basis of the friendship, complete equality, all-round fraternal cooperation, and mutual political, economic and cultural assistance of all the nations and nationalities. In other words, it has become the essential principle in the economy, culture and every-day life of all the peoples of the USSR. It assures the conditions for effective use of the advantages of socialism and for the further all-round convergence of nations and nationalities.

Socialist internationalism, which embodies the objective tendencies in the development of socialist nations, is the essential element of the new type of international relations and serves the joining of socialist peoples into an indestructible community.

Among other things, the new socialist community of people exercises an increasing influence on the development of the socialist type of personality and its unity with society. Socialism has delivered people from class exclusiveness and in full measure asserted their social nature. This does not mean that in the Soviet Union the personality has become "standardised" or that it has again acquired its "primordial sameness", as anti-communist ideologues would have us believe. Socialism has not made the personality any poorer. On the contrary, it is providing for its harmonious and all-round development. This is why the greater unity of the Soviet people in the present stage of communist construction is closely linked with the moulding of the new individual.

There are two extremes in interpreting the concept "Soviet people". One of them is that the "Soviet people" possesses all the requisite properties of a nation: it has a common economy, territory, a language of communication, and spiritual identity. By implication, it would be just as right to name it "Soviet nation". The other opinion is that the "Soviet people" represents no more than a political, state entity. But both these

views are wrong. The fact that Soviet people are acquiring more all-Soviet, international features does not mean that the population of the USSR has become a new nation. Although the Soviet people does have properties resembling those of a nation (community of territory, economy, spiritual identity), warranting the use of such concepts as "all-national pride of the Soviet man" and "national interests of the Soviet state", it is not a new nation. It constitutes a higher, international community, the unity of all the nations and nationalities of the USSR.

Bourgeois ideologues are apt to draw a parallel between the emergence of the single Soviet people and the coercive assimilation seen in the capitalist world. But that is a crude distortion of the facts. Imperialism suppresses, even exterminates, whole peoples, whereas the nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union are in full flower, and are drawing together on the basis of socialist democracy. As for the individual cases of merging of small ethnic and ethnographic groups with various nations, it occurs on a strictly voluntary basis.

The emergence of the new historical community—the Soviet people—is no mechanical levelling out of nations or neglect of national features, languages, and cultures. In the developed socialist society the achievements of every nation and nationality—organic and indivisible parts of the Soviet people—are an object of pride and the possession of the entire Soviet people. This is the basis of the all-national pride of the Soviet people common to all nations and nationalities in the country. The Soviet people has absorbed the common, stable and important from the economic and cultural life of each of the socialist nations and nationalities.

The concept "Soviet people" came into being as a reflection of radical changes in the essence and image of Soviet nations and nationalities, an expression of their all-round convergence and of their increasingly pronounced international features. Given the close intertwining of the international and national, socialist nations constitute the Soviet people, while they remain its independent components. Complete equality of nations and combination of the interests of the USSR with those of the constituent republics are important principles of the national policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state. In Soviet conditions

there are no rational grounds for opposing the international to the national and vice versa.

The Soviet people is not an ordinary sum of nations and nationalities. Neither is the Soviet Union a conglomerate of national republics and regions. It is an organic union, an integrated system, a new qualitative condition of a multinational society.

Socialism and the fraternal union of peoples is the source of the outstanding successes of the Soviet nations and nationalities. Anti-communists claim that the Soviet nations and nationalities owe their achievements exclusively to the 20th century scientific and technological progress. But the facts show that it was able to assure the spectacular ascent of formerly backward peoples to the peaks of modern production, science, technology and culture only in combination with the advantages of the socialist system. The success of each Soviet republic embodies the great power of socialist internationalism. The striking achievements of the peoples of the USSR are the result of their joint labour. The Soviet nations and nationalities owe their prosperity to close cooperation, mutual enrichment, and gradual convergence.

The Party is working for greater democracy in all bodies of power and government—from local to central. The leaders of the republican administrations, representing the working people of all Soviet nations and nationalities, are simultaneously members or leaders of Party or state organs at Union level. This principle is also followed on an increasing scale in the central institutions of science and culture. The broad and varied participation of Party and government officials of all levels in all-Union bodies is graphic evidence of the democratic nature and internationalism of the system and structure of Party, government, and science and culture organs, harmonising the national and international interests of the Soviet nations and nationalities.

The democratic centralism of socialist federation assures steady development of Union and national statehood as an unbreakable unity. The extension of the competence of the republics is favourable for local initiative and the creative activity of the masses. And in the final analysis it serves to invigorate the new community rather than weaken the unity

and might of the Soviet people (as the ill-wishers would have it). The national republics wield full legislative, executive and judiciary powers over their territory. Soviet people are bearers of one sovereignty in its two identities—as citizens of their republic and as citizens of one common state, the Soviet Union. By improving their national state they improve the state of their Union.

The economic and social-political community of the socialist nations and nationalities has paved the way for active participation of the working people of all nationalities in culture, science and technology. Their spiritual affinity is growing closer. The national cultures are drawing together. The Soviet nations and nationalities have a single socialist culture—single in spirit and fundamental content—an amalgam of the spiritual values of all the peoples.

The emergence and development of the Soviet people as a new historical community has produced such concepts as “Soviet fatherland”, “Soviet country”, “Soviet patriotism”, “Soviet character”, “Soviet economy”, and “Soviet culture”. These concepts, which have gained a profound content, reflect the close dialectical unity of the national and international. Whatever their nationality, Soviet people have such common features as love of their country and affection for other socialist countries, proletarian socialist internationalism, loyalty to communism, the communist attitude to labour, a high sense of civic duty, collectivism and comradesly mutual assistance, socialist humanism, and intolerance towards national and racial enmity, towards enemies of communism and peace, and towards opponents of the friendship and freedom of the peoples.

Since these and other features of the Soviet character reflect the new socialist relations and are shaped by the society in its advance to communism, by the Marxist-Leninist ideology, they are all clearly internationalist. But they have also become national features, because their bearers are members of different nationalities.

This confirms what Lenin wrote in 1914: in contrast to capitalism, which estranges nations, socialism “creates new and superior forms of human society, in which the legitimate needs and progressive aspirations of the working masses of each

nationality will, for the first time, be met through international unity, provided existing national partitions are removed".¹

The Soviet Union is the first model of this higher form of human cohabitation. It has become the fatherland of the entire multinational Soviet people. All Soviet people cherish and are proud of their one fatherland.

*"Many years of practical experience have shown all the peoples of the country the rich benefits of their unity within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the great opportunities it opens up in the future."*²

This knowledge is a source of Soviet patriotism, for it grew not upon the soil of "segregated fatherlands", but out of joint labour and struggle "for socialism as a fatherland".³ Every Soviet patriot is aware that both the common and the particular interests of the peoples are served by the close unity of the Union and national statehood. All Soviet people know that there can be no internationalism, and hence no Soviet socialist patriotism, without consideration for the whole and universal.

In short, the Soviet socialist nations, which have a common socialist fatherland, a common socialist economy and class structure, a common Marxist-Leninist world outlook, and the common aim of building communism, acquire a more and more distinctly international communist behaviour, life style and psychology. The Soviet community is a concentration of the achievements and valuable features of all nations and nationalities. In addition to national community, the Soviet people have a higher international community. Whatever nation or nationality of the USSR they belong to, they proudly regard themselves first and foremost as Soviet citizens.

The appearance in the developed socialist society of a new and broader concept, that of the all-Union pride of the Soviet man, is a great gain. "The national pride of the Soviet man is a feeling that is vast, all-embracing and immensely rich in content. It is broader and more profound than the natural national feelings of each of the peoples forming our country.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 38-39.

² *On Preparations for the 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*. Resolution of the CC CPSU, p. 14.

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 163.

It has absorbed all the finest accomplishments of the labour, courage and creative genius of millions of Soviet people.”¹

* * *

The new historical community, the Soviet people, is advancing towards complete social homogeneity and the complete unity of nations and nationalities. Defining the Party's objectives, the 24th Congress of the CPSU set out a clear and meaningful programme on this score.

It is the international and patriotic duty of every Soviet citizen to ensure that all the mutually connected social processes taking place in the USSR should be oriented on invigorating and improving the new historical community of people and its single fatherland—the Soviet Union. In keeping with the level of socialist development attained by the labouring classes and strata, the nations and nationalities, and mindful of the dialectics of growth from developed socialism to communism, the 24th Congress set the task of stimulating the objective development of the Soviet people through the further convergence of the labouring classes and social groups, of mental and physical labour, and of the levels of production, culture and life in town and village, and also the convergence of nations and nationalities.

The CC CPSU resolution On Preparation for the 50th Anniversary of the USSR reaffirmed the resolve expressed by the 24th Congress to follow Lenin's course, promoting the all-round convergence of Soviet nations and nationalities, assuring closer and deeper ties between them, and thus making their international socialist unity still more enduring.

The development of the Soviet people as a new historical community is secured by all the interconnected social processes in the country. However, every major social task involves a whole set of interconnected problems. To overcome the essential distinctions between town and village, for example, there must be a substantial expansion of the agricultural productive forces, a higher degree of socialisation of collective-farm and cooperative property, and an uplift of culture in rural areas. For mental and physical labour to merge, its character must be changed on the basis of modern science and

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, p. 86.

technology, which, in turn, involves a higher level of technical culture and, consequently, a merging of education with productive labour.

The 24th CPSU Congress noted the importance of comprehensive town and village planning, converting agricultural labour into a variety of industrial labour, eliminating outdated customs and traditions, cultivating the internationalist Marxist-Leninist world outlook, and consolidating the socialist way of life.

The Congress set the targets of visibly improving the living standard, satisfying to the maximum the Soviet people's material and spiritual needs, approximating conditions in town and village, and assuring further voluntary convergence of all nations and nationalities. This is designed to assure harmonious and all-round progress, leading to still closer social and international community of the Soviet people.

The moral and political unity of the workers, collective farmers and the socialist intelligentsia is growing more solid, and this paves the way for their all-round convergence. The working class is the basis of this unity. By virtue of its growing technical proficiency and rising culture it is able to perform still more actively its role of leader in advancing the Soviet way of life, in affirming the lofty socialist norms of human relations.

In a multinational country like the USSR special significance attaches to the further consolidation of the Leninist friendship of the peoples. A splendid result of socialism, it powers swift and spectacular progress in communist construction, and is a necessary condition for the fullest possible realisation of socialism's historical advantages over capitalism.

The Programme of the CPSU envisages the achievement of the total unity of nations and nationalities, which is one of the most important conditions for building communism. This goal is brought closer by the ever more definite social homogeneity of the developed socialist society and the more intensive drawing together of nations and nationalities.

To achieve complete unity it is also essential to overcome all manifestations of nationalism, to create an atmosphere of unyielding intolerance towards nationalism in socialist society.

The USSR is the first multinational country in which the ideology of internationalism has been victorious. The abolition

of the exploiting classes and socialist construction have destroyed the social roots of nationalism. Whatever remnants of it still exist have no hold on the masses. But the Party is aware that bearers of nationalist prejudices still occur, and calls attention to the tenacity of prejudice, of inflated or distorted national feelings, and parochialism. They must be fought and eliminated, for they are impermissible in a developed socialist society.

To create a favourable ambience for themselves, nationalists pass off the old-time narrow national petty-bourgeois patriotism for socialist patriotism, and assiduously emphasise the sensitiveness of national feelings. But national feelings, which the Party has always treated with the utmost consideration, are one thing, and nationalist feelings are another. They are intolerable, especially in a developed socialist society. Considerate treatment of national feelings should not imply an easing, let alone termination, of the concrete struggle against nationalist manifestations. This is doubly necessary, because nationalist prejudices are being encouraged and inflated by imperialist strategists in the hope of undermining the unity of the Soviet people.

The 25th CPSU Congress reaffirmed the importance of eliminating all nationalist tendencies in order to assert the new image of the Soviet man, his communist morality and outlook.

In its resolution *On Preparations for the 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the USSR*, the Central Committee of the CPSU pointed out that it is "the duty of each Communist to strengthen in every way in the people the realisation that they belong to a single socialist Motherland, to the great internationalist army of the builders of the new society".¹

The building of the material and technical basis of communism, consistent observance of Lenin's principles in relation to the friendly classes and social groups, nations and nationalities, and timely elimination of non-antagonistic contradictions as soon as they develop, provide the right conditions for bringing up true collectivists and internationalists, people with a communist morality, and consequently for consolidating and advancing the Soviet people as a new

¹ *On Preparations for the 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*. Resolution of the CC CPSU, p. 26.

historical community of builders of communism. This community, in which the flowering and convergence of socialist nations continue, is the determining form of the Soviet Union's continued progress and the prototype of still broader future international communities.

The emergence of the world socialist system added to the number of peoples drawn into processes leading to the formation of international community. The objective laws of socialism—the two interconnected tendencies in the development of nations and national relations, the deepening and extension of cooperation and mutual assistance among nations, the evening out of their economic and cultural levels, etc.—operate both in the separate socialist countries and on the scale of the entire socialist community. And while we must not forget that these objective laws are influenced by the distinctive national features of each of the countries in the world socialist system, we should also bear in mind that the latter no longer constitutes an ordinary sum of states with the same social-economic system.

The CPSU Central Committee's Report to the 25th Congress stressed that "the ties between socialist states are becoming ever closer with the flowering of each socialist nation and the strengthening of their sovereignty, and elements of community are increasing in their policy, economy, and social life. There is a gradual levelling up of their development. This process of a gradual drawing together of socialist countries is now operating quite definitely as an objective law".¹ In all fields—economy, politics, and culture—the Marxist-Leninist parties of the socialist community are guided by the principles of proletarian, socialist internationalism. The unity of the national and international in the life of socialist nations and nationalities is determined by the objective processes of the internationalisation of the productive forces, the general laws governing the making and development of socialist society, and by its competition with and opposition to capitalism.

Being the world's first socialist country, the Soviet Union has achieved the greatest success in uniting all its nations and nationalities. Now, having entered the period of communist

¹ *Report of the CPSU Central Committee and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy*, 25th Congress of the CPSU, p. 9.

construction, it is still in the lead along the road to the complete unity of the peoples. But the basic point is that all the enumerated processes are part of the essence of socialism in general. The degree to which various problems are resolved in the different socialist countries depends on the duration and rate of their development, and on the complexity of the issue at hand. The main thing is that socialism — provided distortions of its principles are avoided — always asserts the friendship of the peoples, their approximation and unity, and leads to the development of new social and international communities of people.

“When the question of uniting the Soviet Republics in a single Union of Soviet Socialist Republics arose 50 years ago, Lenin pointed out that the Union was necessary in order to withstand the military onslaught of imperialism, to defend the gains of the Revolution, and to accomplish the peaceful creative tasks of socialist construction more successfully by common effort.

“In principle, the same applies to the fraternal community of sovereign socialist states that have united in the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.”¹

The international socialist division of labour and the Comprehensive Programme for the economic integration of the CMEA member-countries, their all-round cooperation, provide new, tremendous opportunities for the drawing together of nations, for strengthening socialism's international positions. The countries of the socialist community approach cooperation not from purely national positions, but from those of socialist internationalism, showing concern for the good of each of the countries in the community.

The all-round economic, political and cultural cooperation of the socialist nations, their drawing together, is a necessary precondition for the extension and development of new historical communities of people. That is the main thing. Fraternal cooperation and mutual assistance turns socialist nations into a close-knit family of peoples jointly building and jointly safeguarding the new society.

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, pp. 42-43.

III. THE NATIONAL QUESTION AND THE REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS

To comprehend the problems of the development of nations and national relations in full depth, they must be examined against the background of the social processes, their dynamics, and the content of the epoch. Lenin taught us to join up the nationalities question with the historical epoch in general, and also with the concrete features of the development of nations and national relations in the particular country. Also necessary, as he saw it, was "a strictly exact and objectively verifiable analysis of the relations of classes and of the concrete features peculiar to each historical situation".¹

Today, the development of nations and national relations is an important element of the main tasks facing the peoples. The main task of the peoples of the world socialist system is to build socialism and communism. For the peoples of the developed capitalist countries the main task is to secure general-democratic anti-monopoly transformations paving the way for socialist revolution. And for the peoples of the developing countries the main task is to consolidate their national independence, to repattern society, and to overcome backwardness.

The historical and economic approach to the development of nations and national relations naturally also requires a clear differentiation between the content of the national and international processes depending on the socio-economic system. In the case of capitalist countries, the important task in the context of the national question is to eliminate the division of nations into oppressor and oppressed and to assure freedom of development for the latter. Also important are the internal

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 43.

processes in the development of the dominant nations and their relationship with each other. For the developing countries, the substance of the national question is to eliminate direct or indirect imperialist oppression and dependence on imperialism, to unfold the processes of national consolidation, and assure the formation and free development of nations and nationalities.

Socialism has destroyed national oppression. It has assured a truly free development for nations and national relations. In the socialist countries, therefore, it is a matter of raising the degree of development, the degree of national consolidation, and of strengthening the friendship and cooperation of the peoples.

The development of nations and national relations has a strong bearing on all other aspects in the life of society. Being the base for the unity and progress of the peoples, the world revolutionary process, too, is influenced by the development of nations and national relations.

For many reasons, the present stage in history is marked, as Lenin said, by a tremendous acceleration of the development of the world, on the one hand, and by the existence alongside the socialist world of presocialist forms of social relations, on the other. In these conditions the development of nations and national relations should be examined against the background of the struggle between the forces of socialism and capitalism, taking into account the duration of the period of coexistence of states with different social systems. This coexistence will still continue when the peoples of the present-day world socialist system go from the stage of developed socialism to the stage of communism and the developed bourgeois countries experience a further sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism accompanied by accelerated monopoly concentration. The peoples of the young national states will develop in the setting of political independence and of struggle against the neocolonialism of the major imperialist powers, in conditions of a social-economic and political reorientation.

The development of nations and national relations is strongly influenced by the solution of the national question in the USSR and in the other socialist countries. The Soviet experience, to quote Jacques Duclos, has greatly enhanced

"the Soviet Union's influence in the countries that had known colonial oppression. This example inspired and sustained the peoples in their struggle for national and social liberation".¹ And in the Report on the Centenary of V. I. Lenin's Birth, L. I. Brezhnev pointed out: "The triumph of Lenin's policy on the national question, the Soviet Union's solution of the problem—one of the most acute and most difficult in social life—is an undertaking of tremendous importance, and a major stride forward in mankind's social development."²

The influence of the successful development of nations and national relations in the Soviet Union and the world socialist system on the progress of all mankind materialises both in the use of their experience, as model, and in direct aid to the working people of capitalist and developing countries. The extent of this influence is in direct proportion to the stage of socialism reached by the people of the socialist countries.

Unlike the period of socialist construction, when nations develop largely on the basis inherited from capitalism, developed socialism enables them to perform the passage to communism on a completely socialist basis. Naturally, the formation of nations anew is a possibility—from socialist nationalities or as the result of the amalgamation of several nationalities. The main element in this stage is the growing maturity of socialist nations and their gradual and steady drawing together. The most substantial changes, of course, take place in multinational states: the national processes, i. e., the development of the main characteristic features of nations, become deeper; the national unity of the peoples becomes more solid; the essence and form of relations between nations change, especially through mutual influence and the mutual enrichment of national cultures. In the Soviet Union, for example, the progress of nations and nationalities in the setting of developed socialism finds its expression mainly in a further consolidation of the Soviet people as a new historical community.

Far-reaching changes are also observed in the relations between nations of the world socialist system. Among other things, the international factor is gaining greater significance

¹ *World Marxist Review*, No. 3, 1966, p. 2.

² L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1972, p. 278.

than the specific national, and a drawing together of nations is under way in all fields.

The present content of the development of nations and national relations is determined mainly by the basic features of the socialist and capitalist social systems, and their struggle on the world scene. A very strong influence on these processes is also exercised by the current scientific and technological revolution.

It was clear by the beginning of the third stage of capitalism's general crisis that the balance of world forces had changed strongly in favour of socialism, that imperialism had lost the historical initiative, and that socialism had become the main trend in world development.

In the past two years the relation of strength between the two world systems has changed still more in socialism's favour. Examining world developments, the 25th Congress of the CPSU found that all imperialist attempts to halt the world revolutionary forces and prevent the strengthening of socialism, have been in vain. Socialism's positions are growing stronger each day. "No impartial person can deny," says the CPSU Central Committee Report to the 25th Congress, "that the socialist countries' influence on world affairs is becoming ever stronger and deeper." The CPSU Central Committee described this as "a great boon to mankind as a whole, to all those who aspire to freedom, equality, independence, peace and progress."¹

In area, the major imperialist powers and their colonies occupied 8.6 per cent of the earth's surface in mid-1974, with 14.3 per cent of the world population. Meanwhile, the share of the socialist world has changed tremendously: it accounts for 32 per cent of the world population and about 40 per cent of the world's industrial production.

The steady decline of world capitalism is due, among other factors, to the almost complete political disintegration of its colonial system. In 1919 colonies and semi-colonies accounted for 72 per cent of world territory and 69.4 per cent of the world population. By the mid-seventies the figures are 3.3 per

¹ *Report of the CPSU Central Committee and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy*, p. 8.

cent and under 1 per cent respectively. Since the beginning of the third stage of capitalism's general crisis there have appeared on the map something like 50 new national states. The last vestiges of colonialism are crumbling. In recent years, the peoples of Guinea-Bissau and the Cape Verde Island, Angola and Mozambique liberated themselves through armed struggle, and the national liberation movement in Zimbabwe, Namibia and the South African Republic has been gaining in intensity.

Not only the balance of world forces speaks of the doom of capitalism. A no less important factor is that the capitalist social-economic formation has in the main used up its intrinsic sources of development and become a brake on the progress of mankind. Many of the newly-independent peoples have publicly announced their rejection of the capitalist way. The vast majority of the African political parties which have published their programmes declare quite explicitly in favour of a "socialist economy". True, only a small proportion of the peoples that won political independence have so far made their final option. But that they recognise the advantages of the socialist over the capitalist economy is quite apparent. This is to be traced to the successes of the peoples of the Soviet Union, of all the socialist states, in building the new life.

That capitalism has lost the leading role in world development does not mean that we can now write off its influence on the life of the peoples, on relations between nations.

Lenin identified imperialism with consolidation and expansion of national oppression and colonial plunder, with ever more intensive oppression of nations.¹ And this is true today. Besides, the division of the non-socialist world into oppressor and oppressed nations has become visibly greater. Although over 1,500 million people have won political independence, imperialism still oppresses them economically. The imperialists have replaced the old colonialism with neocolonialism, which is just as dangerous, and have stepped up oppression and exploitation of peoples in the developed capitalist countries, thus slowing up the national and international processes.

Some of the new qualitative aspects of modern capitalism are exercising a strong influence on the development of nations

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 409; Vol. 22, p. 143.

and national relations in the third stage of capitalism's general crisis. The observation that concentration of capital on a gigantic scale is the most characteristic and the most substantial feature of imperialism rings just as true today as it did when Lenin made it half a century ago.

This growing concentration of monopoly capital takes the form of mergers of large companies into still larger ones, which have in recent years begun to assume a distinctly conglomerate character, amalgamating enterprises active in entirely different fields.

The US economy is now controlled by 8 major financial capitalist groups including about 2,000 wealthiest families. In the early 1970s, roughly 0.5 per cent of the US population amassed about \$600,000 million with the Dupont family alone controlling over \$150,000 million worth of assets. It is estimated that by the 1980s only 100 multinational monopolies will control over two-thirds of industrial output in the capitalist countries.

Here are a few figures to illustrate the degree of concentration of monopoly capital. In 1948, two hundred of the biggest US corporations controlled 48.2 per cent of the country's fixed capital, and by 1972 as much as 60 per cent. In 1929, the richest one per cent of the US population owned two-thirds of the private joint-stock capital, and some 40 years later more than three-quarters. In 1969, one-third of the national wealth and more than 70 per cent of the production assets in the FRG were concentrated in the wealthiest families comprising a mere 1.7 per cent of the country's population. And in Britain, 1.5 per cent own 58 per cent of all private property. It is obvious that such powerful economic leverage enables the monopolists to exercise a strong influence on the national and international processes.

This is essentially a negative influence, and only one of its aspects—its objective effect of stimulating the growth of the productive forces—may facilitate the progress of nations and national relations.

On the eve of the October Revolution, Lenin noted that capital "is already international and is becoming more so".¹

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 22.

First, because it does not bother about national frontiers and strives to operate in countries where the profits are bigger. Second, because the number of transnational corporations, uniting capital from many countries, is growing.

By the end of 1973, direct private US investments abroad were officially estimated at \$107,200 million, whereas according to the well-informed *Wall Street Journal* they amounted to no less than \$250,000 million as early as 1971. Only in 1969-1971 the total sum of the banks' and corporations' short-term credits on the world monetary and capital market increased from \$162,000 million to \$268,000 million, while their short-term commitments went up from \$134,500 million to \$202,000 million respectively. The Chase Manhattan Bank alone has 1,600 branches outside the country. Annual production abroad by US corporations adds up to something like \$200,000 million, or to six times as much as total US exports.

The tentacles of the imperialist monopolies have entwined dozens of nations. General Motors (USA) as well as Siemens (FRG) operate in more than 100 countries.

Export of capital is one of the chief forms of exploitation. And the main imperialist powers are fighting bitterly among themselves for the "right" to such exploitation. Of late, US monopoly capital has had to concede ground to its rivals, especially the FRG and Japan. According to *Fortune* (August 1972) in 1958-70 industrial output in Japan increased 449 per cent, Italy 150, the FRG 110, Canada 100, France 89, USA 82, and Britain 48 per cent. Inflationary processes and the devaluation of the dollar, which have reduced the outflow of capital abroad, are other factors weakening US positions. As a result, the United States is tailing other countries in rate of growth of foreign investments. Whereas West German investments increase 21 per cent annually, US investments grow by only 9 per cent. Direct investments of the FRG concerns abroad in 1961-1972 increased 5.5-fold, while the export of commodities increased only by 80 per cent.

Imperialist Japan is rapidly consolidating its positions. Though still to a certain degree dependent on US imperialism, it has steadily strengthened its economic situation, and this to a certain extent by exploiting other peoples. This was facilitated

by the very rapid growth of its industrial power and national product: in 1967 it outstripped France, in 1968 Britain, and in 1969 the FRG. Now, it occupies a firm second place in the capitalist world after the United States, and is even ahead in a few industrial fields. In recent years, the flow of Japanese monopoly capital abroad has increased. By April 1972 it already totalled \$4,500 million, and has since continued to grow by \$1,000 million yearly.

Export of capital to, and unequal trade with, the developing countries is highly lucrative for the monopolies. In the early 1960s, for example, the former lost an annual \$20,000 million or one-sixth of their gross national product in repatriated foreign profits, plus non-equivalent exchange. These losses are rising. Due to imperialist discrimination and other factors, the share of Asia, Africa and Latin America in the world's foreign trade is now a mere 20 per cent, against 31.7 per cent in 1950. The less developed countries also suffer tremendous losses from the artificially depressed prices on their goods: Brazil, for example, a loss of \$2,600 million in 1957-1969, and Venezuela as much as \$5,000 million in the past 10 years.

To exploit the developing countries, monopoly capital makes extensive use of various international organisations. The interests served by the International Monetary Fund, for example, are easily identified by the fact that out of the funds it gave its members in 1970 to balance international settlements, the USA received \$900 million, while all the African countries together received \$60 million.

The "progressively mounting oppression of the nations"¹ by imperialism in the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism, predicted by Lenin, has some new features. One of them is that apart from exploiting the peoples of developing countries and the few remaining colonies, imperialism is also bearing down on developed capitalist nations by pumping in foreign capital. By the end of 1973 direct private US investments in Canada were \$28,050 million, whereas in all Latin America they were \$18,400 million.

The correlation of foreign investments in developed capitalist and developing countries has begun to change substantially.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 409.

In 1950-1967 US direct investments in developed capitalist countries as a percentage of total investments abroad climbed from 48.3 to 67.2 per cent, while declining from 51.7 to 32.8 per cent in the case of developing countries. Due to the higher rate of profit, the tendency to channel investments into developed capitalist countries is also evident among monopoly firms of other imperialist powers. The West German monopolies, for example, directed 57 per cent of their investments to European countries and only 30 per cent to developing states.

The mutual penetration typical of the present stage of monopoly capitalism is graphic evidence of its total indifference to the national interests of even its own country. Britain's balance of payments difficulties are well-known. Yet capital exported from that country to the EEC countries in 1973 alone added up to £519 million. And the fact that £100 million was injected into the British economy by the monopolies of those countries only made matters worse. Now the country is more and more dependent on US imperialist diktat.

Of late, the so-called transnational (or multinational) monopolies, the number and economic power of which are steadily rising, have begun to exercise a visible influence on national relations in the capitalist world and on the struggle of the labouring masses for social and national emancipation. Four thousand US companies alone have 17,000 branches overseas. The transnational monopolies control nearly 15 per cent of the gross national product of the capitalist world. Their output rises almost four times as fast as capitalist world's annual average. And their growing influence has given a new angle to the problem of strengthening the international solidarity of the workers and other working people of the capitalist countries.

The struggle of the masses against the transnational monopolies is headed by the Communist and Workers' parties. They expose the anti-popular essence of these monopolies and the social consequences of their activity. Marxists-Leninists show the working people how monopoly capital unites its forces against the working-class movement, subjugates organs of the state, ignores the national independence and sovereignty of the peoples, and the like.

The aim of the Communists is to safeguard the interests of the working class, to draw the necessary conclusions and buttress the theoretical and ideological foundations of proletarian internationalism, to consolidate the joint revolutionary actions of the working class of different countries.

A deep-going examination of the new phenomena of monopoly capitalism was made by the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties. Valuable data are published by the communist press, and especially in the journals *World Marxist Review*, *Political Affairs* and *Labour Monthly*, and the newspapers *L'Humanité*, *L'Unità*, and others. The West European workers' struggle against transnational monopolies was discussed at a conference of 15 Communist and Workers' parties in January 1972. Their communiqué noted that these monopolies are a danger not only to the struggle for social emancipation of the workers and all working people, but that they also jeopardise national sovereignty and the democratic gains of the masses. Measures were charted to coordinate the battle against them.

The need for the solidarity of the working class of all countries to stem the offensive of the transnational monopolies was discussed at the World Anti-Imperialist Assembly of Trade Unions in Santiago in April 1973.

This has helped to strengthen the class solidarity of the workers of all countries, especially in Western Europe. Dozens of international actions have already taken place there, and considerable experience of class struggle has accumulated, chiefly against monopolies with enterprises in different countries. The metalworkers, dockers, and the automobile and chemical workers of France, the FRG, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland and other countries, stand in the forefront of the battle against transnational monopolies.

Apart from the growing concentration of monopoly capital, the national interests of the peoples suffer serious and ever greater damage from the growing aggressiveness of imperialism.

This entails tremendous expenditure on wars and their preparation, paid for mainly by the masses. In November 1970 the *New York Times* reported that since 1945 the United States had spent \$ 1,100,000 million for military purposes. Between

1961 and 1970, according to the United Nations, as much as \$1,870,000 million was spent in the world for military purposes, or 150 per cent more than for health and 30 times more than for aid to the developing national states that have risen on the ruins of the imperialist colonial system. The military expenditure of the members of the aggressive NATO bloc is especially great. In 1975 it totalled \$150,000 million.

The national interests of a number of countries are also impaired by the fact that the expansionist ambitions of their reactionary circles stem from the policy not only of their own monopolies, but also from the influence of foreign imperialists. The part played by US monopolies in stimulating revanchism and militarism in the FRG, for example, is common knowledge. To revive the forces of revenge and aggression in that country, to make it a bastion of anti-communism, the US monopolies pumped huge funds into the FRG economy. In the past 20 years their investments there increased 17-fold. The same may be said of Japan, where militarism and revanchism are being ever more frankly encouraged by US monopoly.

It follows that not only imperialist war, which, to use Lenin's words, always is "violence against nations",¹ but also its preparation, extremely costly to the peoples, disrupts the natural course of affairs and has a negative effect on national relations.

Imperialism's armed ventures and succession of defeats are evidence that the positions of the world capitalist system are growing weaker. Capitalism's general crisis is sharper, and getting sharper all the time. This is confirmed by the intensity of the workers' class battles, the ever more acute contradictions between the imperialist powers and the contradictions between these powers and the oppressed peoples, coupled with the scale of the general democratic movement. The resistance to monopoly omnipotence is growing. For a number of years, the capitalist world has been unable to end the monetary and financial turmoil.

US imperialism's lesser role is another striking fact, speaking of the weaker positions of world capitalism.

The international working class and working people the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 285.

world over, notably the peoples of the socialist community, did not reduce their struggle against reaction and war throughout the postwar period, fighting for the free development of nations and for relations of peace. Their success in the struggle is particularly apparent now, when a far-reaching turn has come about towards international detente.

To be sure, imperialism is still by nature reactionary and aggressive. The changes in policy were forced upon it and are the result of the inexorably changing correlation of forces on the world scene in favour of socialism. No longer can monopoly capital conduct its policy unimpeded, because its aggressive designs are invariably punished and its anti-popular essence becomes more and more discernible.

The Peace Programme of the 24th CPSU Congress has contributed very greatly to the present changes in world development, and has won universal acclaim. "The main pillars of our socialist revolutionary course in international affairs were laid by the great Lenin," L. I. Brezhnev said at the April 1973 plenary meeting of the Party's Central Committee which made a review on the Party's international activities. "And we are as loyal as ever to his instructions and precepts."

The class-oriented foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state is based on proletarian internationalism. Its purpose is to assure a favourable international climate for building communism in the USSR, for the positions of world socialism, for the international working class, and the national liberation movement.

The foreign policy of the CPSU and especially L. I. Brezhnev's visits to the United States, France and the FRG, have greatly increased the possibility of preventing a nuclear war, restoring and strengthening mutual confidence, and expanding mutually beneficial cooperation. The Final Act of the Helsinki Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe in August 1975 produced a set of principles governing inter-state relations. They respond to the requirements of peaceful coexistence and have created favourable conditions for the maintenance and consolidation of peace. The facts have confirmed the timeliness and realism of the Peace Programme. "And though world peace is by no means guaranteed as yet," said CC CPSU General Secretary

L. I. Brezhnev in the CPSU Central Committee Report to the 25th Congress, "we have every reason to declare that the improvement of the international climate is convincing evidence that lasting peace is not merely a good intention, but an entirely realistic objective. And we can and must continue to work tirelessly in the name of achieving it!"¹ All nations, big or small, will benefit from this. But the impact of the detente is particularly great for the smaller nations and nationalities, because new prospects are opening for their peaceful and free development, and their active participation in the resolution of essential international problems.

The Soviet Communist Party, all the Marxist-Leninist parties of the world, consider it their duty to rally the international working class, the working people of all countries, consolidate gained ground, and make irreversible the positive changes. The growing unity of the Communist and Workers' parties on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, the cohesion of the socialist community and the increasing might of world socialism are the guarantee that the detente processes will continue to deepen. Meanwhile, the influence of the world communist movement and the impact of the Soviet Union and the fraternal countries of the socialist community on the development of mankind is becoming deeper, and the support of the mass of working people broader.

The Marxist-Leninist parties have lined up with the foreign policy of the CPSU. Take the Communiqué of the Crimean meeting of the leaders of the Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist countries. All participants commended the foreign policy of the CPSU, the recent major actions on the international scene in line with the Peace Programme, the negotiations with the principal capitalist states, and the consequent treaties and agreements.

Full support for the foreign policy of the CPSU has also been expressed by the leadership of Marxist-Leninist parties in capitalist and developing countries. Henry Winston, National Chairman of the Communist Party of the USA, for example,

¹ *Report of the CPSU Central Committee and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy*, p. 21.

said: "The Leninist strategy of peaceful coexistence provides an offensive weapon to the anti-imperialist forces".¹ Nicolas Chaoui, General Secretary of the Lebanese Communist Party, hailed the Soviet-US agreement to abstain from the use and threat of force, and wrote: "All anti-imperialist national forces regard this point of the agreement as direct support for the struggle of the Arab peoples, because it blocks a possible intervention of imperialist armies and navies against the Arab national liberation movement, as this occurred in the past."²

A Central Committee plenary meeting of the Peruvian Communist Party said that the decisive factor assisting the revolutionary changes in Peru is the world socialist system, and hailed the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.³

The scientific and technological revolution is influencing the development of nations and national relations in different ways. First, its social consequences blend with the tendency towards economic, political and cultural internationalisation and impel powerful integrational processes, notably in the economic domain. Second, it exercises a doubtlessly serious influence on the social structure of nations, mostly by reducing the "national agglutination" of classes and social strata. Third, it is also influencing the development of every individual, eroding the national features of the personality and reducing their significance.

The role of the integrational processes is very great. This applies to both socialist and capitalist society. Also great is the influence of the economic and political development of peoples on the development of nations and national relations. However, economic, political and cultural internationalisation, spurred by the unfolding scientific and technological revolution and leading up to integration, occurs in entirely different ways under socialism and capitalism. Referring to the tendency towards internationalisation and the concomitant centralisation and concentration, Lenin pointed out that in the imperialist environment these processes cannot occur without

¹ *Pravda*, July 21, 1973.

² *Pravda*, July 24, 1973.

³ *Pravda*, August 3, 1973.

contradictions, conflicts and upheavals, and this not only in the economic and political, but also in the national, domain.¹ This is still entirely valid for the present stage of centralisation and concentration, which flow directly from the scientific and technological revolution. As for socialist society, as Lenin had predicted, the tendency towards internationalisation in the conditions of the world socialist system is one of the main pillars of the friendly relations and convergence of nations.

Socialism, Lenin said, internationalises all sides of the life of nations. This is borne out by the present cooperation and mutual assistance of the peoples of the world socialist system. Among other things, socialism has proved to be a mighty accelerator of the economic internationalisation of the free peoples, paving the way to a world socialist economy.

The economic integration now under way in the CMEA framework is speeding up the natural course of development of the peoples of socialist countries, enhancing the friendly nature of their relations, and at the same time facilitating the independent development of each nation. Integrational processes in the capitalist environment follow an entirely different course. It is clear, for example, that the European Economic Community has from the outset served US imperialism and European monopolies as a means for deepening the division of Europe into capitalist and socialist parts, and was to lay an economic foundation for the aggressive NATO bloc. Borrowing Lenin's words, we may say that it is only a temporary agreement "for the purpose of jointly suppressing socialism in Europe".² The EEC Treaty is an attempt to stabilise the international division of markets among the monopolies. Also the three rival monopoly groups—the US, French and West German—pursued their particular aims. Each of them expected to seize the leading role in Europe's political unification on the basis of economic integration. Their propaganda popularised projects of a United States of Europe, a supranational European government, and the like.

However, the monopolies did not reckon with the actual masters of Western Europe—the peoples there. They ignored

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 107.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 341.

their national interests, flouted their national feelings, and spurned national and state sovereignty.

The struggle of the masses against the monopoly designs was headed by the Communist parties.

De Gaulle was one of the bourgeois leaders who opposed the "illusions of integration". And not only because he represented the independent interests of the French monopolies, but also because he understood the stability of the national processes.

The efforts of the monopoly groups to fan nationalism and chauvinism in their own countries and to implant a passive, even nihilistic attitude to sovereignty in other nations, proved in vain.

In his book, *European Integration and the United States*, bourgeois economist Lawrence L. Krause admitted that "economic integration has probably increased the desire for independence rather than reduced it".¹ There are two conclusions to be drawn from the situation in Western Europe. First, it is foolish to expect that a political alliance of European countries will come about any day. Second, it is impossible to build a really workable political community of peoples until allround ties have been forged between the peoples of the capitalist and socialist countries of Europe.

The development of nations and national relations in the modern world is very strongly influenced by the integrational processes and the generally growing ties between peoples in all spheres. This growth of ties occurs at different rates and in different forms, depending on a variety of factors: the social-political system, the development level, scientific and technological progress, and the like. Ties between peoples depend not only on objective, but also on subjective factors and, in fact, the role of the latter is steadily increasing.

In capitalist conditions the trend towards closer unity of nations through extended economic and cultural ties is inhibited by the continuously growing social contradictions. To see national life in capitalist conditions through Marxist eyes, Lenin used to say, is to see it precisely "from the standpoint of

¹ L. Krause, *European Economic Integration and the United States*, Washington, 1968, p. 230.

the class struggle".¹ Referring to the Latin American countries, the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties noted, for example, that "the national feelings of the peoples and economic difficulties might compel even some governments to take important measures against imperialism."²

Generally speaking, however, national feelings and national community depend on many factors, not least of all the policy of governments, the interests of monopoly, the influence of foreign imperialism, and the like. How this affects nations and national relations in the United States, the citadel of imperialism, is described in one of the July 1970 issues of *Newsweek*. Almost all the prominent scientists asked to speak on "the spirit of the 70s", noted a decline of national feelings, a surge of nihilism in questions of national development, division within the nation, and more hostile national feelings towards Blacks. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., referred to the nation's fragmentation. Noting that this condition is still "incipient"(?), he stressed the urgent need for "a national reconstruction that will bring the estranged and excluded groups into full membership in our national community".³ Eugene D. Genovese, too, noted the antagonistic nature of national relations in US society. Black people, he said, have understood the failure of the officially advertised programme of integration as a result of white resistance to Black control of Black communities.

For all the scientists who dealt with the problem in *Newsweek*, the future of the United States looks definitely bleak. Andrew Hacker, for example, said in reference to the remainder of the 20th century: "We can no longer be a single nation, possessed of a common spirit."⁴

In connection with the bicentenary of the US, Daniel Bell, a well-known American sociologist, had to admit that the myth of the American exclusiveness has been dispelled, that there is

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 23.

² *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties*, Moscow 1969, p. 17.

³ *Newsweek*, July 6, 1970, p. 30.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

no common faith in American society, that it is in a state of confusion.

The sentiment in many other countries is very much the same, especially in connection with the obviously futile hopes of "social peace". But the desire to rally the nation is still stronger in the countries where the reactionary circles try to unite the nation with slogans of revenge and expansion. A particularly strong accent on national feelings, on slogans of "national unity" and "national self-determination", is made by the reactionaries in West Germany. The programme of the neo-nazi NDP reproduces almost word for word the demand of the old nazi programme to arouse the German nation's urge for "self-determination". The Christian Social Union, too, propagates an "all-German national spirit" with an admixture of revanchism. Its leader Franz Josef Strauss hopes to bring different peoples under the umbrella of imperialist Germany in a single Europe built on federative lines.

In connection with Israel's aggressive behaviour in the Middle East, the Western press has turned its attention to the so-called Jewish question. It will be recalled that the formation of a Jewish state in Palestine was supported by the progressive public in 1948 on the condition that there would also be an Arab national state in Palestine territory. But Israel at once became a tool of international imperialism, for Zionist elements were in the latter's service. The national interests of the Palestine Arabs were trampled upon. World reaction, fighting against the national liberation movement, began banking on Israel. Despite the incontestable consolidation of the Jewish nation in Israeli territory, Israel's claims that it represents an alleged "worldwide Jewish nation" are groundless. They are contrary to common sense. Irrespective of whether or not Jews are accorded the right to self-determination in the country where they reside—as they are in the Soviet Union, or as they are not in most capitalist countries—they are, in fact, mere ethnic groups in one or another stage of assimilation with the nation in whose midst they live. Not only are these groups dissociated, but they also differ substantially from each other in language, habits, cultural and psychological features, because in most cases they adopt them from the peoples with which they cohabitate.

Zionism has nothing in common with the national interests of Jews. It has long since become a tool of imperialism's neo-colonialist policy. Zionists and anti-Semites alike distort the real substance of the Jewish question, and give it racist instead of class overtones.

The changes in the content and form of national and international processes in modern capitalist society are powered by a variety of factors. These are connected with the laws of world capitalism and also with the social consequences of the scientific and technological revolution. Furthermore, an important part is played by the deliberate adaptation of the monopoly bourgeoisie to the conditions of the present-day world. However, capitalism's attempts to adapt to these new conditions have failed to stabilise it as a social system. Its general crisis is continuing to grow. This crisis reflects on the development of nations and national relations, materialising in a succession of national-democratic revolutions and in protests against the disruption of national independence by foreign capital, and sharpening contradictions between peoples within developed capitalist states. The advancement of the ideology, policy and practice of proletarian internationalism in the struggle against nationalism and chauvinism is incontestable.

Proletarian internationalism grows and develops continuously and is becoming the crucial factor in social progress.

The ideology of proletarian internationalism is continuously developed by the Marxist-Leninist parties, the international working class. And the process of the world's revolutionary renewal has a decisive bearing here, for as Gus Hall said at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, the three-pronged worldwide revolutionary process is the motive force and fresh fount of internationalism. "The winning of power by the working class and its allies is the greatest contribution which a Communist Party fighting under capitalist conditions can make to the cause of socialism and proletarian internationalism,"¹ says the Resolution of that International Meeting. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Marxist-Leninist parties of other socialist

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 37.

countries, where internationalism is part of the outlook and social practice of working people building their life on new foundations, play an ever increasing theoretical and practical role in the development of proletarian internationalism.

In present conditions proletarian internationalism is developed through a) enrichment of its content, b) greater diversity of its forms, c) extension of its sphere of operation, and d) its greater role as the key social factor in society's revolutionary reconstruction.

As a result, not only the working class, but also its allies base their policy and social practice on internationalism. More and more, proletarian internationalism is becoming part of the outlook, moral and psychological behaviour of individuals. New combinations of the national and international, of the democratic and socialist factors, have appeared in keeping with the needs of working class, its life and struggle. This is due to the expansion of the social basis of the world revolution in the present stage. The class alliance of the proletariat of different countries, of its mass organisations, is complemented by extended ties and various forms of united action with farmers, the intelligentsia, the youth, and a variety of general democratic organisations.

Proletarian internationalism has travelled a long way from the first isolated manifestations of class solidarity by proletarians of different countries to the growing unity of the international working-class movement; from workers' sympathy in metropolitan countries for the liberation struggle of oppressed peoples to the ever firmer alliance of the international working-class movement with the national liberation movement; from support of the October Revolution by the revolutionary movement in all countries to the multilateral alliance of the world socialist system with the international working class and the national liberation movement in the single world revolutionary process. This is the ultimate evidence of the changes in the content and forms of proletarian internationalism. Only recently, proletarian internationalism was expressed chiefly through the political and ideological unity of proletarians of different nationalities. Today, it is an operational interaction of the three streams of

the mighty world revolutionary process, concrete cooperation of countries and peoples, classes and parties in the struggle against monopoly capital, concrete cooperation in building socialism and communism. More, this cooperation stretches far beyond the social-political and theoretical-ideological domains to common defence of the attained gains, to economic development, development of culture, and the shaping of new social relations.

In the contemporary world proletarian internationalism manifests its great potency in the unprecedented intensity of the strikes in the developed capitalist countries, the far-reaching social-economic changes in socialist-oriented countries, and the passage of the peoples of the world socialist system from the more rudimentary forms of economic cooperation to socialist economic integration, and so on.

In the present stage, the further development and increasing role of proletarian internationalism is spurred by several factors, of which the leading one is the greater revolutionary action unity of all the forces fighting against imperialism. The need for anti-imperialist unity based on internationalism could not be more apparent. The objective of the world's transition from capitalism to socialism is unattainable without it. And none but the world communist movement and the working class of all countries—which follow the ideology of proletarian internationalism—can provide effective leadership in the drive for this objective.

The obvious weakening of the imperialist forces, however, does not mean that imperialism's aggressive nature has changed. It goes to all lengths to retain its hold on its still remaining positions. Despite the contradictions that exist—and sometimes even grow sharper—between the imperialist powers, they are effecting a common global strategy against the world socialist system, the international working class and the national liberation movement. This has polarised the world forces. The huge mass of working people, the middle strata, the intelligentsia are learning from experience that only the socialist way is the way to progress, that only by irreconcilable struggle against imperialism can peace be preserved, social oppression and inequality stamped out, and democracy safeguarded. This is why there is the incontestable

tendency for the anti-imperialist forces to be more active, and to rally round world socialism.

In the developed capitalist countries, farmers, intellectuals, employees in service industries, students, the youth, and other social groups, have ranged themselves with the working class in the struggle against monopoly and the state apparatus that has fused with monopoly. The movement for free national development is a new front of struggle within the world capitalist system. The scale of the democratic movement of national minorities in the United States, Britain, Belgium, Canada and Spain, has grown to unprecedented proportions. And in quite a few countries the popular masses, even a section of the bourgeoisie, are stiffening their resistance to the erosion of national independence by foreign capital.

Another new front of the anti-imperialist struggle is the ever more active participation in international affairs of peoples that once were little more than objects of history rather than its makers. They stake their claim to full independence in internal affairs in no uncertain terms. The peoples of the socialist-oriented countries are playing a bigger part in settling questions of world development. And it is important that the number of these countries is steadily growing, that their experience is gaining more popularity.

The emergence of new social forces in the fight for the revolutionary renewal of society speaks of the growing scale of the anti-imperialist struggle, and of a qualitative change in its content. There is the growing conviction among the masses that only a social revolution can solve all the urgent social problems and that here the working class is the main striking force.

That is the objective foundation for the yet unequalled urge of the masses to unite under the banner of proletarian internationalism.

The unity of the masses in the anti-imperialist struggle, their gravitation towards internationalism, are powerfully influenced by the socialist world. Its true freedom and democracy, its tireless struggle for peace and against aggression, its support for all progressive forces and aid to peoples building a new life—those are just a few of the aspects of socialism's internationalist essence and advantages over capitalism.

The objective need for extending the influence of world socialism on the social development of all the countries of the non-socialist world is propelling the further development of proletarian internationalism. It is also propelled by internal processes within the world socialist system. The building of socialism, which follows universal objective laws, takes different forms in accordance with concrete historical conditions and specific national features. Success in building socialism depends in many ways on the correct combination of the general and specifically national in the development of society. This also applies to the successes of socialism in individual countries, and to a still greater extent to its successes in shaping the inter-state relations and cooperation of socialist countries and the social fabric of world socialism.

The further development of internationalism as an expression of the class interests of the proletariat, as the means of uniting the socialist countries, enhances its social role within the world socialist system and the world revolutionary process in general.

The role of proletarian internationalism in society is therefore determined by many new phenomena. Especially important among these is the fact that internationalisation of the political, economic and cultural life of the peoples is continuing steadily, that the national and international tasks of the working class of different countries are objectively identical, and that the world communist movement and socialism are international by nature.

Proletarian internationalism is the principal means for solving many cardinal questions—uniting the international working class, assuring unity of forms and methods of struggle against imperialism and for the triumph of socialism and communism; uniting all democratic forces in the fight for peace, freedom and democracy; resolving the national question and assuring the development of nations and national relations along progressive lines; overcoming all manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism, cosmopolitanism and national nihilism, and eliminating racism, genocide, and the like.

The growth of the role of proletarian internationalism may be traced mainly to the greater numbers and the bigger social

role of the international working class. In recent years, the 25th CPSU Congress noted, "The strength and prestige of the working class are greater, and its role of vanguard in the struggle for the interests of working people, the true interests of the nation, has increased."¹ The facts confirm the conclusion drawn by the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties that the present large battles of the working class are but the forerunners of new and larger battles, likely to result in fundamental social transformations and the establishment of working-class power in alliance with other sections of working people.

Once the objective factors for social revolution are ripe, the ideology of internationalism is a powerful weapon in the hands of the working class, assuring progressive change and unity of all advanced forces in the drive for socialism on earth. And here the role of the Marxist-Leninist parties, of the advanced workers, is particularly great.

The social basis of the world revolution has expanded. The influence of proletarian internationalism has spread to the workers' allies in the battle against imperialism. Hence the immense importance for the Marxist-Leninist parties of studying the problem of combining socialist and democratic tasks, and working out the most effective forms for this in different concrete situations.

To quote Khalid Bagdash, the Syrian Communist leader, "defence of internationalism and efforts to spread its spirit to the national liberation movement was and remains one of the most difficult tasks facing the Syrian Communist Party".² He described this task as basic, stressing that no Communist can afford to ignore it.

Participants in the movement for national liberation nowadays approach common problems from class positions. This is a credit to the international working-class and communist movement, which has spread proletarian internationalism to the national liberation movement.

In following the example of the Communists, revolutionary-

¹ *Report of the CPSU Central Committee and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy*, p. 34.

² Khalid Bagdash, *Selected Articles*, Moscow, 1970, p. 73 (in Russian).

democratic parties are gradually giving up their non-class approach to the interests of the nation.

Some of the leaders of the Arab national liberation movement, for example, once spoke of the nation's single interest and overlooked the existence of classes and the class struggle. Now, under the impact of events, their attitude is changing.

There is this other important result of proletarian internationalism's beneficial influence: in the course of the common struggle for national liberation the working class and the labouring masses obtain an ever clearer view of their own specific interests. Under the influence of the Communists and the progressive elements active in the revolutionary-democratic parties, the alliance of the national liberation movement with the world socialist system and the international working-class movement is growing steadily stronger.

So, the role and significance of proletarian internationalism increase with the growth of the anti-imperialist struggle and the successes of the general world revolutionary process. This is additional evidence of the crisis of world capitalism. Yet bourgeois propaganda in general, and the ideologists of anti-communism in particular, allege that there is a crisis of proletarian internationalism, in which they are directly or indirectly joined by opportunists and revisionists of Right and "Left". They tend to confine the variety of manifestations of internationalism to national frameworks, that is, reduce their significance to just the class struggle or socialist construction in a specific country, totally unconcerned about the international tasks, including that of promoting the role of world socialism. In so doing, they deny the thesis, repeatedly stressed by Lenin, that the interests of the proletarian struggle in one country are subordinate to the interests of the struggle on the global scale.¹

There are those who obviously disbelieve the strength and viability of the ideology and policy of proletarian internationalism, and the already available significant experience. Hence the talk about a "crisis of internationalism" and attempts to involve the international communist and working-class move-

¹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 148.

ment in a search for a "new unity", "the highest form of unity", and the like. To "substantiate" the "crisis of internationalism", they sometimes maintain that its basic causes are of an objective character and follow from the successes of the world revolutionary process. This is entirely contrary to the facts, which, as we have shown, objectively necessitate the development of proletarian internationalism, of its social role, of its sphere of operation—its spread to the many nonproletarian forms of the anti-imperialist liberation movement.

The 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties made a profound analysis of the current processes of the world's revolutionary renewal and showed the great danger of deviations towards opportunism and nationalism. The key to the problems of our time is in correctly combining the national and international tasks of the working class and its parties, in shifting the centre of gravity of international solidarity from community of ideological and political views to unity of revolutionary actions. The world socialist system is now the decisive force in the anti-imperialist struggle and in mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism. For this reason, the 1969 International Meeting described protection of the gains of socialism as one of the principal manifestations of internationalism.

The events have confirmed the conclusion of the International Meeting that the most effective way of strengthening unity is joint action by Communists, the working class and its allies, and all the revolutionary forces of our time fighting for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism. The 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union noted rightly that united action is yielding success after success: the cohesion of the world communist movement is becoming more distinct, the unity of the countries and peoples of the world socialist system is becoming more solid, and the interaction of the streams of the world revolutionary process more extensive.

The 25th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in February-March 1976 was a show of unshakeable loyalty to proletarian internationalism. As many as 103 Communist, Workers', national-democratic and socialist parties of 96

countries sent their representatives to take part in it. In their speeches they noted the successful implementation of the joint course mapped out by the communist and workers' parties to surmount the centrifugal forces in the world communist movement and cement the unity of the three streams of the world revolutionary process, and referred to the immediate tasks of strengthening the unity of action of all revolutionary forces. The 25th Congress described the greater influence won by the Communist and Workers' parties in the capitalist world as another significant development of the past five-year period. Their membership has increased by nearly one million, and the number of electors voting for the Communists in parliamentary and local elections has gone up considerably. The Congress found that many of the objectives of the anti-imperialist action programme advanced by the 1969 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties have already been fulfilled. "Along with the Communist parties of other countries," the CPSU Central Committee Report to the 25th Congress said, "we can now say that the road and the main objectives of the struggle had been defined correctly, and that joint work for the good of the peoples has evoked a broad response among the masses and is yielding useful results."¹

The Marxist-Leninist parties of countries belonging to the world socialist system displayed a strong desire for still closer unity of the main revolutionary forces of our time.

The 25th CPSU Congress laid special stress on the importance of proletarian internationalism, one of the chief principles of Marxism-Leninism, at the present time. In its report to the Congress, the CPSU Central Committee condemned attempts to emasculate the revolutionary content of internationalism and allegations that the views of the Marxist-Leninist classics are outdated. As the CPSU sees it, the Report said, "to renounce proletarian internationalism is to deprive Communist parties and the working-class movement in general of a mighty and tested weapon. It would work in favour of the class enemy who, by the way, actively coordinates its anti-

¹ *Report of the CPSU Central Committee and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy*, p. 36.

communist activities on an international scale. We Soviet Communists consider defence of proletarian internationalism the sacred duty of every Marxist-Leninist.”¹

Delegations of Communist parties of developed capitalist countries reaffirmed their determination to work for the unity of the international working-class and national liberation movements. The irrepressible offensive of the world revolutionary process, its growing power and the unity of its motive forces, said CP USA General Secretary Gus Hall in his speech at the 25th CPSU Congress, is the main factor behind the realities of our epoch. Herbert Mies, Chairman of the German Communist Party, said the reactionary forces were trying to undermine the unity of the world revolutionary process by fanning anti-sovietism. The Communists’ main task in their ideological work, an expression of their national and international objectives, is to repulse anti-sovietism. “We Communists of the Federal Republic of Germany,” he added, “combat anti-sovietism mainly in the interests of the working class in our own country, defending the national interests of our own people. We observe Ernst Thaelmann’s principle. The attitude to the Soviet Union, he used to say, is always the big test for us Communists. Thereby we contribute to the further consolidation of the unity of the world communist movement.”

The internationalist solidarity of the socialist community and the international working-class movement with all fighters against imperialism is an extremely important factor in the liberation struggle of all oppressed peoples.

Proletarian internationalism is becoming the watchword of all the fighters for national liberation.

The contribution of the Soviet Communist Party and the Soviet Union to the victory of the peoples of Vietnam, Mozambique, Cambodia, Laos, Guinea-Bissau and Angola is in the best traditions of proletarian internationalism, said Joussuf Dadou, Chairman of the South African Communist Party, in his speech at the 25th CPSU Congress. He described proletarian internationalism as a vitally necessary factor in the people’s struggle for peace, national liberation and socialism.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

One more important reason why it is socially essential for the role of proletarian internationalism to increase in the present stage is that the old world, growing weaker and losing one position after another, is trying to exploit nationalism on an ever larger scale. In studying its essence and forms it is therefore extremely important to bear in mind Lenin's instruction: "...an abstract presentation of the question of nationalism in general is of no use at all."¹

In the present stage of history we are witnessing a great, unparalleled social struggle between the forces of the old, declining capitalist world and the new, rising socialist world. Following the victory of the October Revolution, Lenin said, the face of the modern world is determined by a duel of "two methods, two political and economic systems — the communist and the capitalist".² One of the characteristic features of this contention is a certain increase of the role and significance in society of different forms of nationalism.

Bourgeois ideologists are at pains to portray nationalism as something incognisable, the roots of which reach into the "nature of the spirit", the domain of the individual's psychology, irrespective of his class background. Nationalism is ascribed a providential role in the development of peoples, even in the fate of social-economic formations. Take the authors of the book, *Nationalism in Contemporary Latin America*. They maintain that nationalism flourishes "as never before and has become so widespread and all-embracing that one of its foremost historians, Hans Kohn, has recently described the present era as one of global pan-nationalism".³ For Walter Kolarz nationalism is the hope of the sinking capitalist world. He expects salvation from it: "...in the end," he says, "communism may have to capitulate to nationalism all over the world."⁴

Bourgeois ideologists like to identify the reactionary, anti-national content of nationalism with such social phenomena as

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 36, p. 607.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 456.

³ A. P. Whitaker, D. C. Jordan, *Nationalism in Contemporary Latin America*, N. Y., 1966, p. 1.

⁴ Walter Kolarz, *Communism and Colonialism*, London, 1964, p. 12.

the oppressed peoples' urge for freedom, for national self-assertion, defence of national interests, the natural development of the tendency toward national unity, etc.

In present conditions, the manifestations of nationalism have indeed become extremely diverse. Apart from such "traditional" forms as the nationalism of the oppressor and oppressed nations, of big and small nations, there are also other manifestations. These are fostered by: the expansionist ambitions of monopoly, its wish to make its merchandise more competitive; violations of free will and equality in mutual relations; discontent over solutions of questions of development in the framework of a state alliance between one people and another or a group of peoples; the urge to assure the interests of one's own nation only; national vanity or egoism, etc. As for the content of nationalism and its links with the economic and political life of peoples, that is a still more complicated question invariably connected with basic social changes, the policy of classes, parties and states.

One of the reasons generating nationalism in the capitalist world may be traced to the sharpening competition between US monopolies and those of other countries, the struggle for spheres of investment. How much sharper this competition has become may be seen from the continuous weakening of the positions of US imperialism, which is gradually being elbowed out by its rivals, first of all the monopolies of Japan and the FRG. The US share in capitalist world industrial output has shrunk from 56 per cent in 1948 to 41 per cent in 1970, and in capitalist world exports—from 25 to 13 per cent respectively. In the setting of the scientific and technological revolution, the manufacturing industry has become the main sphere of capital investment. Yet it developed in the course of the competitive struggle that the positions of US monopoly are anything but strong in this field. First, the US is increasingly falling behind Western Europe in growth rates: during the period of 1953-1974 its per capita industrial output increased 70 per cent, while in Western Europe the increase was 440 per cent, and the proportion of 5.6 to 1 in the respective levels of per capita output at the beginning of the period dropped to 1.7 to 1, though it is still in favour of the USA. Second, the share of exports in the output of the US manufacturing industry is only

11.6 per cent, whereas in that of Japan and the FRG it is over 38 per cent, in Britain and Canada about 50 per cent and in Holland as much as 75 per cent. Japan, the US monopolies' main rival in many industrial fields, sells almost one-third of its exports in the United States, with exports exceeding imports (in 1972 by \$4,200 million). Japan invested a third of its capital abroad in the US economy. And its average annual investments growth rate is almost twice that of the United States.

The above figures show the state of the competitive struggle and the prevailing tendencies. This struggle is ineluctably accompanied by chauvinism and nationalism towards the rival. Criticism of Japan has become particularly strong in the United States in recent years. In 1970-1973 US Congress even went to the length of restricting the growth of Japanese imports. US monopoly goes out of its way to fan nationalist sentiment among workers: replying to the Automobile Workers' Union wage demands, which concerns as many as 700,000 workers, the US producers referred to the necessity of combating Japanese competitors in the world market. And the Japanese, West German and other competitors of the US monopolies repay them in kind, laying a special stress on anti-Americanism in their bellicose brand of nationalism and chauvinism. It is quite clear that the rivalry of monopolies, which control vast media of ideological conditioning, will continue to be accompanied by nationalism, and this is bound to affect relations between nations and peoples in capitalist countries.

The nationalist ideology is also highly complex and contradictory in countries shaking off the yoke of imperialism and colonialism. It is often an amalgam of bourgeois, petty-bourgeois, feudal and tribal nationalism, and a though still incipient but already hypertrophied national consciousness. The influence of religion — both the "native" and that brought in by missionaries — is also strongly felt as is that of different schools of utopian socialism, coupled with the influence of scientific socialism.

The fairly widespread term, "progressive nationalism", is not entirely justified. In all cases, nationalism is the bearer of national exclusiveness and isolation, mistrust and hostility, tending to enclose peoples in a "national shell". Consequently,

it is a reactionary ideology. Admittedly, at certain stages elements of democratism do enter nationalist slogans. But this does not eliminate the reactionary in the content of nationalism, and supercedes it only temporarily. Revolutionaries, first of all the Marxists-Leninists, recognise and support nationalism precisely in those cases when the elements of democratism it contains are capable of strengthening the progressive in the national movements.

Lenin, for example, described such nationalism not simply as progressive, but as bourgeois-progressive. He warned that support and recognition of nationalism must not become an apologia of nationalism, and should be confined strictly to its progressive elements. Otherwise, it might befog the consciousness of the workers with bourgeois ideology. He stressed the necessity to combat *all* nationalism, be it ever so "just", "clean", refined and civilised.

It is not nationalism but the democratism contained in national movements that is progressive, Lenin pointed out, adding that since revolutionaries fight for consistent democratism, including democratism in the solution of the national question, they may at definite stages support national movements and the democratic in the content of nationalism. To go any farther, Lenin said, is to help strengthen the reactionary in the content of nationalism.

Communists take guidance in Lenin's propositions on this score, and support the nationalist ideology of the revolutionary democrats in the developing countries in the context of the present day situation. But though the relative share of the democratic element in this type of nationalism has doubtlessly increased, it still cannot be described as unreservedly and fully progressive.

There is also this other point to be borne in mind in determining the Marxist-Leninist attitude towards the nationalism of revolutionary democrats. As they conceive it, the nationalist ideology includes all the notions of social, as well as national, progress. And it is that side of nationalism officially proclaimed in many countries as the ideology of parties and states—the side which represents *social* renewal—that is influenced, among other things, by different socialist teachings, and partly by scientific socialism.

No less complex in form and content, and complex also due to what causes them, are the manifestations of nationalism in the working-class and communist movement, in the socialist countries. In many respects they are of a psychological, and not only social, origin. Sometimes, too, they stem from the heterogeneity of the working class in capitalist conditions, when part of its upper echelon is infected, as Lenin said, with colonial chauvinism or influenced by elements with a petty-bourgeois background.

The forms of this nationalism vary. There may be outright deviations from proletarian internationalism towards petty-bourgeois nationalism, or conciliatory postures towards national egoism and exclusiveness, vanity and arrogance.

Often, as Lenin said, there is evidence of "pretensions to *Great-Power status*".¹ In the case of a large nation this may manifest itself in calls for hegemonism in foreign affairs and an assimilatory policy at home. In the case of smaller nations, especially those that before liberation had had to defend their independence, and even existence, for many centuries against the pressure of the great powers (while oppressing national minorities at home), these "pretensions" may surface even after the foundations of socialism have been laid. They are directed at national minorities, which are denied true equality, and also towards other socialist countries, weakening unity with them by contrived claims of "neutrality" in the fraternal family of peoples. They may also take the form of an over-sensitive "protectiveness" towards national and state sovereignty, though no one has the least intention of violating it.

Hence, history confirms Lenin's proposition that save for the elements of democracy that it may contain in certain conditions, nationalism is a negative factor in the life of peoples not only from the standpoint of their class interests, but also their national interests.

To overcome nationalism is now one of those highly important tasks which, as Lenin put it, "promote the development of mankind towards a new way of life that is alien to all privileges and all exploitation",² i.e., towards socialism.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 21.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 20, p. 22.

Many of these tasks are tied up with the national question. None but the working class can fulfil them.

The role of the working class in the development of nations and national relations derives from its place in the life of society and in social production. It is the main producer of the material values of every nation. Developing along with the expansion of production, it is necessarily pushed into the vanguard of the working people. Its high degree of political consciousness and organisation, and assimilation of Marxism-Leninism, the most advanced revolutionary theory, place it at the head of all the progressive forces of the nation. And, in both socialist and capitalist society, it also stands in the van of all classes and strata in developing all the national factors and in enriching them with the achievements of other nations, in safeguarding the national interests.

The aforesaid does not conflict with the fact that the bourgeoisie is the organiser of the capitalist nation. The maker of the new mode of production at the time of ascendant capitalism, the bourgeoisie had, in fact, been at first a more developed class than the proletariat. But even in those days the proletariat was the incontestably more consistent protector of the interests of the nation, because from the very beginning the bourgeoisie did not hesitate to betray them if its class interests were imperilled. True, the proletariat, too, puts class interests above the national, but with this difference: the interests of the proletariat *always* coincide with the interests of the vast majority of the nation, whereas those of the bourgeoisie do so only in a few cases and at certain stages (formation of the nation, defence of national independence, and the like).

The leading role of the working class in the nation does not depend on its numbers. It derives from the workers' place in the economy and politics, their degree of political consciousness and organisation, their ability to rally the masses and to lead them to progress. But it is also important to take stock of their steadily growing numbers, the growth of their share in the population, first of all, because the significance of industrial production for the nation's economy and its relations with other nations, is rising. Furthermore, there is also the related effect of urbanisation. Even in the Asian, African and, particularly, Latin American countries it has gone quite far.

Latin America's urban population in 1970, for example, was 40 per cent of the total, Asia's 20 per cent, and Africa's 17 per cent.

According to the UN estimates by the year of 2000 the urban population in the developing countries will be three times greater than in 1970: it will grow from 622 million to 2,087 million.

The role of the working class in the national consolidation processes now under way in many parts of the world has changed substantially. It has become considerably greater compared with the period of ascendant capitalism, when the bourgeoisie was virtually the sole organiser of nations. In the case of countries and peoples that have after attaining political independence opted for the non-capitalist way, the formation of new nations is no longer headed by the bourgeoisie, but by revolutionary-democratic elements under a greater or lesser degree of proletarian influence. But here, too, the role of the working class is steadily increasing in such areas as building the new national state, creating material and cultural values, strengthening national ties and enriching the nation with the achievements of other nations. Wage-workers in the developing Asian, African and Latin American countries totalled 230-235 million by the beginning of 1973, about one-quarter of them in industry. This growth derives not only from economic progress, but also from the steady growth of the public sector.

The role of the working class is also growing in the developed capitalist nations. Progressive democratic forces fighting against monopoly domination and in defence of democracy are rallying more and more round the working class. So, naturally, the workers' role in the development of nations changes. It becomes increasingly urgent for them to assume the leading role in the nation's life. The ways of achieving this were defined by the 1969 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, which drew up a programme for organising a united anti-imperialist front under working-class leadership in capitalist countries.

In "Lenin and the New Problems of the Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism", an article in the July 1970 issue of *World Marxist Review*, the late Tim Buck, Chairman of the

Communist Party of Canada, made a deep-going analysis, using Canada's example, of the changing role of the bourgeoisie and the working class in the life of developed capitalist nations. The Canadian bourgeoisie, he pointed out, has betrayed the interests of the country. In the past 20 years, control of the national economy and the country's national resources has shifted to international monopolies with headquarters in the United States. The working class, he noted, is increasingly prominent in defending the true national interests. "The Communist and Workers' parties, leaders of the revolutionary forces of the working class," Tim Buck wrote, "are called upon increasingly to make the vital leap from theory to practice. They have to assume responsibility for the *guidance of the nation*. They have to project and fight to win support for concrete democratic alternatives to the nihilistic policies of the monopolies, which now are leading to national disaster. They have to fight by all democratic means that are available and others that will be developed, in the course of the struggle, to take over the actual ideological leadership of the nation."¹

The reactionaries are infuriated by the consistent defence of national interests by the working class and its Marxist-Leninist parties. Bourgeois and right-reformist ideologists try to distort the actual state of affairs. The leaders of the Socialist International, who in a 1969 resolution rebuked the Communists for allegedly following a policy of "limited sovereignty", know perfectly well that this is a lie. This theory was, in effect, officially proclaimed in the programmes of many Right-Socialist parties. Take the "Basic Programme" of the Socialist Party of France, adopted in July 1962. It says plainly that "if the sovereignty of states, a historical phase in the evolution of peoples, perpetuates itself in its present form, it will act as a brake on the economic, social and cultural development of humanity and will increase the dangers of war."² It is precisely "limitations on sovereignty", it goes on to say, "that permit extension of the international market and a progressively

¹ *World Marxist Review*, No. 7, 1970, p. 4.

² *La Revue Socialiste*, Paris, Juillet 1962, No. 155, p. 133.

universalised organisation of the economy, and expansion and better distribution of production in the interests of the peoples".¹

The disregard for national sovereignty shown in the programmes of the Right-Socialists is, of course, only a weak echo of the interests of monopoly capital. This is easily seen from the more than candid utterances of Western ideologists and politicians. The West German philosopher Karl Jaspers, for example, maintains that rejection of national sovereignty by a people should be regarded as "an act of political grandeur". The concept of a sovereign state, he says, is outdated as a result of political development. No longer is it the spirit of national statehood, the idea of the homeland, the people, that should inspire the real representatives of the nations, but a "spirit of self-assertion".² What this boils down to, however, is the West German monopolies' yearning to dominate other peoples. Lawrence B. Krause, a US bourgeois economist, contends that "the concept of a national market loses its meaning when business enterprises have no single nationality".³ The French jurist Pierre Vellas holds that the "fragmentation of Europe into sovereign states" is one of the reasons why Western Europe's development is behind that of the United States".⁴

Bourgeois politicians are still more outspoken. Former US President Lyndon B. Johnson declared in March 1966 that the old and narrow conception of sovereignty is less and less acceptable for modern society. And the Prime Minister of Canada, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, who had frequently declared that his country's sovereignty must be protected against the penetration of North American monopolies, replied to French Canadians aspiring to self-determination and sovereign rights, "It is not the concept of *nation* that is retrograde; it is the idea

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 134.

² Karl Jaspers, *Lebensfrage der deutschen Politik*, München, 1963, S. 314; *Freiheit und Wiedervereinigung. Über Aufgaben deutscher Politik*, München, 1960, S. 64.

³ Lawrence B. Krause, *European Economic Integration and the United States*, Washington, 1968, p. 147.

⁴ P. Vellas, *L'Europe face à la révolution technologique américaine*, Paris, 1969, p. 39.

that the nation must necessarily be sovereign.”¹ Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber, leader of the Radical Party of France, said he was ready to renounce national sovereignty in favour of a federative Europe. To counter the growing influence of multinational corporations, he believes, the capitalist world needs “political power at the same level.... I think the way is through regional federations. You will have a federation of Europe, a federation of Southeast Asia, a federation of South America”.²

Not the bourgeoisie, but the working class defends the national and state sovereignty of the peoples. And it was on behalf of the working class that the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties stressed in the documents it adopted the necessity of consistent struggle to safeguard and consolidate the sovereignty of peoples and assure the freedom of national development.³

Thorough observance of national and state sovereignty is assured only by socialism. Conversely, limitation of sovereignty and limitation of the right of nations to self-determination follows from the very nature of capitalism. It is only under socialism that the right of nations to self-determination and to the exercise of sovereignty does not conflict either with the nature of the social system or the processes of internationalisation.

Those, in general outline, are the changes that have occurred in the content of the development of nations and national relations in the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism. A more detailed analysis of these changes and their role in the world revolutionary process requires an examination of all three of its streams: world socialism, the international working-class movement, and the national liberation struggle of the peoples.

¹ Pierre Elliott Trudeau, *Federalism and the French Canadians*, Toronto, 1968, p. 151.

² *Business Week*, New York, October 14, 1972, p. 66.

³ See *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969*, pp. 28-29.

CHAPTER TEN

THE WORLD SOCIALIST SYSTEM AND ITS INFLUENCE ON THE CONTENT OF THE NATIONAL QUESTION

1. INTERNATIONALISM — THE DETERMINING SOCIAL FACTOR OF RELATIONS BETWEEN THE PEOPLES OF THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

When the world socialist system came into being, the relations between its constituent states were based for the first time on socialist internationalism. A projection of proletarian internationalism, it had begun to take shape in the relations between the peoples of the Soviet Union before the Great Patriotic War. And its sphere of operation expanded when socialism emerged beyond the limits of one country. It rose to a qualitatively higher level and gained new ideological, theoretical, social and political content.

Socialist internationalism expresses the objective tendencies of the development of nations in the world socialist system. Also, it typifies the new kind of international relations between the peoples, states and parties within that system, and unites the peoples in an indestructible fraternal community.

Today, socialist internationalism is more than just an ideological and political conception. It is also an important social factor in the economic and cultural life of the peoples of the world socialist system, their everyday mode of life. Embodied in the all-round convergence of the peoples, it provides favourable conditions for the effective use of all the advantages of socialism.

Socialist internationalism is also the foundation and the main precondition for the promotion of national interests, since the ruling parties study the national and political features of every country, augment the forms and methods of socialist construction and promote fraternal cooperation and mutual assistance among the peoples.

To harmonise the common interests of the socialist countries with the interests of each, there must be deep consideration for all the national and international processes in their midst.

As a new type of social relations, the social-economic, political and ideological substance of socialism is the same in all countries. The national and international processes seen under socialism may be traced, on the one hand, to the national form in which society develops, and, on the other, to the fact that socialism greatly accelerates the internationalisation of all spheres of life, and assures the drawing together, mutual influence and mutual enrichment of the peoples.

The replacement of public for private ownership and the socialist relations of production have set in motion the same universal laws of socialist and communist construction in different countries, imparted an internationalist character to their home and foreign policy, brought into being common principles of organising socialism, and asserted the single Marxist-Leninist, in substance internationalist, ideology. Yet the practice of building world socialism has confirmed the Marxist-Leninist proposition that the concrete forms of socialist construction—the political organisation of society, the direction of its development, the methods of economic management, etc.—do vary. Furthermore, we must always remember that the single strategy of the international working class, as Frederick Engels put it, adapts itself freely to the diverse conditions of every nation.¹

Emphasising this, Lenin pointed out that Marxist theory provides only the general guidelines, which are applied differently to different countries.²

The national and international processes are dialectically interconnected: the international ones unfold on the basis of the national, and the latter gain depth and become many-sided under the influence of the international.

Among the national processes, the tendency to secure the unity of the nation is one of the first to arise on the basis of the sum total of socialist transformations.

¹ Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 19, S. 124.

² See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 184.

This new unity of the nation takes shape under the guidance of the working class and represents its alliance with the non-proletarian urban and rural labouring masses and with the progressive sections of the intelligentsia. It reposes on the common interests and aims of the different classes and social groups in the struggle to abolish the exploiting system and secure the victory of the socialist revolution, which is unthinkable without the transfer to the proletariat of the nation's leadership.

In some of the European socialist countries, an important advance was made towards national unity when the fusion of communist and social-democratic parties on the Marxist-Leninist basis mended the former division of the working class. Under the guidance of the one united party the labouring classes and strata of the nation were welded into a single whole.

The formation of national statehood, or a qualitative repatterning and improvement of the old statehood, is another important national process taking place in the world socialist system. It is helping to bring broad masses of people into the new economic and political life, and to assure the national progress of the peoples.

The national state is one of the forms of a nation's political organisation. This is also true under socialism. If correctly used, national statehood will continue to accelerate the progressive development of the peoples. Improving national statehood chiefly means all-out democratisation of society, use of statehood as a means to lift up the nation's economy and culture, and spur the political activity and labour of the peoples.

Accelerated economic and cultural development, whereby the peoples of the countries of the socialist community consolidate their national sovereignty, is essential to release the creative forces of the respective nations. And this was put into effect, though the world socialist system provided objective opportunities for shaping the national economic complex in each country without setting up all branches of industry in the course of industrialisation.

The conversion of capitalist nations and nationalities into socialist is one of the most important national processes taking place in the world socialist system. In multinational states, some

of the nationalities advance towards transformation into socialist nations. Free development of the national minorities is given impetus by the democratisation of society. While capitalism confines itself to merely formal proclamations of national equality, socialism provides real opportunities for the rise of the small peoples and national minorities.

One of the main distinguishing features of socialist nations in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is the identity of the basic economic and political interests of all the members of the nation, resulting from increasing social homogeneity. Full homogeneity will be secured in later stages, but the success achieved from the very beginning of the proletarian dictatorship is also significant: the unity of the nation becomes closer on the basis of the worker-peasant alliance, its active participation is secured in the building of a classless society, and more favourable conditions arise for the convergence and ultimate fusion of nations.

The objective national processes in the life of the free peoples have nothing in common with the inventions of Western ideologists, who claim that socialism is anti-national and that the Communist and Workers' parties in socialist countries are constrained to "reconcile" socialism and the growth of national feelings. Yet no real freedom of the peoples in an environment of complete social and national emancipation is conceivable without growth of their national consciousness, without its enrichment through internationalist education, and without fulfilment of international tasks. Enrichment and growth of national feelings, not their depreciation, is typical of socialism. They help people to safeguard the material and spiritual values of their nation, to take pride in its successes and its contribution to socialist construction, to understand the identity of the national interests of different nations and nationalities in the struggle for freedom and the new life.

Our national consciousness, said János Kadar, First Secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, is increasingly becoming a socialist and internationalist consciousness. Nowadays, national feelings and patriotism signify love of country and loyalty; socialist patriotism also signifies brotherhood with all the other socialist countries, and solidarity with the working people of the entire world.

The correlation of the objective and subjective factors in the development of nations changes somewhat under socialism as compared with capitalism. The role of the subjective increases. It manifests itself in the organisational and educational role of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist parties, and in the steadily rising influence of the advanced revolutionary ideology of proletarian internationalism, of Marxism-Leninism in general.

The following basic principles of socialist internationalism have taken hold in the relations between the countries and peoples of the world socialist system, and are practised on a steadily bigger scale: a) defence and strengthening of world socialism as the highest internationalist duty; b) friendship and all-round cooperation; c) fraternal mutual assistance; d) harmonisation of national and international interests; e) mutual confidence and non-interference in each other's internal affairs; f) readiness to contribute to the progress of the community as a whole.

It is wrong to think that the national processes in the life of the peoples lose momentum as the socialist countries become more closely united. Socialism provides a qualitatively new basis for the correlation of the national and international processes. Where private property rules, international processes tend to depress and slow down the national processes of oppressed and dependent peoples, whereas public ownership and the genuine democratism of socialist society assure equally free development for either in an organic unity.

The maximum satisfaction of national interests (in the economy, culture, national statehood and the country's international affairs) is one of the main motives for strengthening international ties. And the stronger the socialist countries become, the more necessary it is for them to consolidate their ties with other members of the fraternal community of peoples.

The harmony in the combination of national and international interests derives not only from the objective laws governing the socialist countries' economic, political and cultural development and their relations with the capitalist world, but also from the will of the working class, the consciousness of working people, the organisational and

educational work of the Marxist-Leninist parties. As the world socialist system advances, some specific national interests will coincide still more closely, and ultimately merge, with international interests. Others will drop away once they are achieved, and will give place to new ones. Consequently, the content of national interests will subordinate to the advance of the peoples towards communism, while the changes will chiefly concern the forms in which national interests manifest themselves.

The intensification of international processes in the world socialist system does not impair the independence and sovereignty of the peoples. Quite the contrary. But it is essential in the interests of socialism that the sovereignty of socialist states should combine with responsibility on the part of every people for the solidity and success of the world socialist system as a whole.

However, consolidation of the state sovereignty of socialist countries does not mean that socialism's tendency towards free and all-round national development is tantamount to greater autonomy of the peoples. That would, in effect, only result in segregation. True, all social processes on a world scale are compounded from the efforts of separate peoples, even individuals. But these efforts do not become a motive force of social progress, of the world's socialist reconstruction, until they are merged or concerted; certainly not through greater "autonomy", i.e., greater isolation. As a result, the world gets qualitatively new motive forces of social development, such, for example, as the world socialist system, the international working-class movement, and the national liberation struggle of the peoples, which blend into one revolutionary world process.

The internationalisation processes in the world socialist system have extremely important social consequences. Unquestionably the main one is the acceleration of the social progress of every people. Also undeniable is the drawing together and mutual enrichment of the peoples.

Assessing national and international processes in the world socialist system, we must correctly understand the complexity and difficulties of forging the fraternal community of peoples. "Socialism," the 1969 International Meeting pointed out, "is

not afflicted with the contradictions inherent in capitalism. When divergences between socialist countries do arise owing to differences in the level of economic development, in social structure or international position or because of national distinctions, they can and must be successfully settled on the basis of proletarian internationalism, through comradely discussion and voluntary fraternal cooperation.”¹

The old system left many unsettled problems in the relations between peoples and between individuals, who cannot change their thinking overnight. As L. I. Brezhnev pointed out at the International Meeting, this means overcoming the national hostility and suspicion that had shaped over the centuries. Furthermore, under socialism it is still impossible to rule out subjectivism and opportunist deviations, which are to one or another extent based on nationalism. But all this is not immanent in the nature of socialism (as anti-communists would have us believe), and has its origin in departures from socialism or in misconceived notions of how to build socialism.

It is extremely difficult to set the correct correlation of the national and international. The difficulty is due to the natural complexity of the social development of the world socialist system; the surviving differences in the development level of separate countries and in their practical economic objectives, exchange and division of labour; the chances of error and subjectivism in the shaping of relations between countries, and possible nationalist tendencies. Lenin anticipated these growing pains, and, among other things, the possible one-sidedness of approach to the crucial problems. “Only by a series of attempts,” he wrote, “—each of which, taken by itself, will be one-sided and will suffer from certain inconsistencies—will complete socialism be created.”²

To make the world socialist system stronger still, the Marxist-Leninist parties are obliged to harmonise the national and international tasks of the peoples of the socialist countries.

The obviously growing interconnection of the peoples, their expanding cooperation and mutual assistance, and the draw-

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 23.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 346.

ing together of nations in the world socialist system should on no account lead to any overestimation of the significance of international processes and underestimation of national processes. This would obviously harm both the political and the economic cooperation of socialist countries.

National processes play an unquestionably important role in the internal life of the peoples of socialist countries at the present stage. This applies to the peoples' economic, as well as political and cultural, development. Yet it was exclusively their cohesion as a united and fraternal family that enabled the peoples of the socialist countries to repulse all imperialist designs and secure conditions of peace for building socialism and communism. And it is just as self-evident that they owe their growing prestige and influence on the development of all mankind to the formation of the world socialist system. It was the international processes that cemented and continue to cement the unity of the socialist countries, heightening their role in the world's transition from capitalism to socialism and communism.

International processes are not contrary to national interests.

Following the establishment of proletarian dictatorship it is the principal internationalist duty of every people to build socialism, and then communism. This is also the main international interest of every people separately, and of their fraternal family as a whole. This is why all imperialist propaganda alleging an antithesis of national and international interests within the world socialist system, is completely off the mark.

It is wrong to think that if in world affairs a country acts on its own, not in the framework of the world socialist system, it has a better chance of satisfying its national interests. Incorrectly understood national interests and international processes in the world at large may give rise to divisive activity in the world communist movement. No matter what rhetoric about defence of national interests is used to conceal the disruption of the common socialist cause, history will never vindicate those who choose to ignore the international tasks of all the peoples of the socialist countries. When the future of socialism is at stake, national interests, however important a role they play in the life of a people, must be subordinated to

the international interest and the common cause of human progress. "We assert," Lenin stressed, "that the interests of socialism, of world socialism are higher than national interests."¹

The correct correlation of the national and international processes, their organic combination, and the free development of both, are based on a number of objective factors. But the conscious activity of the working class and its party, too, plays a very big part. If the Marxist-Leninist party of a socialist country follows the principles of internationalism, that country's policy is bound to be the same as that of all the other socialist countries in the vital questions, contributing to the unity of the peoples, strengthening their friendship and cooperation, no matter what pattern of conditions prevails in that country.

The foundations of the socialist unity of peoples are laid by the proletarian revolution, which is nothing if not internationalist in content. Still more significant is the political cooperation of the socialist states during the building of socialism. Their common socialist principles in home affairs and their united stand in relation to the capitalist world, are essential for the development of each of the peoples and of the socialist system as a whole.

Due to the aggressiveness of international imperialism, the Marxist-Leninist parties and the governments of the socialist countries are compelled to strengthen their political and military alliance.

Due to the specific development of the world socialist system in the past quarter of a century, the common regularities of its progress and socialist internationalism were most fully embodied in the social practice of chiefly the countries of the socialist community united in the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.

Political cooperation and coordinated international action provide favourable conditions for the building of socialism and communism. The Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation is the main coordinating centre of the foreign-policy activity of the countries of the socialist

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 378.

community. The Committee builds its work on the principles implicit in socialist internationalism: responsibility for the future of socialism not only in one's country, but in all the world; respect for the national and historical features of each country's development and readiness to augment its achievements; the maximum use of the advantages of socialism, cooperation and mutual assistance, to speed up the development of the free peoples, enhance the influence of the socialist system on the world revolutionary process, and support the liberation struggle of the peoples against imperialism and for peace, democracy and socialism.

The consistent and coordinated policy of the countries of the socialist community, their close cooperation on the international scene, have greatly increased their influence on world affairs. A good example of this is the firm opposition to the US imperialist adventure in Vietnam, the support given to the Arab peoples, the promotion of collective security in Europe, etc. "Development of the socialist countries, their greater might, and the greater beneficial influence of their international policy," says the CPSU Central Committee Report to the 25th Congress, is now the main direction in mankind's social progress. Socialism's power of attraction has become still greater against the background of the crisis that has erupted in the capitalist countries."¹

Economic cooperation is one of the most important spheres in which socialist internationalism contributes to the progress of world socialism. This cooperation is also the main basis and source for the extension of internationalism itself.

There are those who say that as the nations develop their economies become more independent. Lenin stressed, however, that even under capitalism there is a distinct tendency towards a single world economy regulated under a single plan by the working class of all nations. This tendency comes into evidence at first in the international processes within each socialist country, and then takes root in all spheres of interstate relations between the socialist countries in the CMEA, in their

¹ *Report of the CPSU Central Committee and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy*, p. 33.

bilateral economic ties, in the Warsaw Treaty, and in the various forms of cultural cooperation.

Socialist relations of production alone give considerable impulse to the growth of the productive forces of each country. But for their still more powerful growth in the present conditions there must be an international division of labour based on specialisation and cooperation in production. This is shaped by the cooperation of the sovereign socialist states, inasmuch as socialist reproduction in the framework of the world socialist system will for still a long time to come proceed on a national basis.

The productive activity of the individual countries is planned by their own government agencies, but also in the framework of the socialist community through the coordination of the national plans.

The socialist international division of labour impels swift growth of the national economies. This, for its part, provides the basis for the further growth of the might of the socialist community. That is the dialectics which impels the flowering and drawing together of socialist nations.

As a result of their economic, scientific and technical cooperation in 1949-1975, the industrial output of the CMEA countries increased more than 15-fold. Their economic levels are beginning to balance out, and preconditions have been created for an ever fuller development of the socialist international division of labour. The deep-going integrational processes in crucial areas of economic cooperation are of the utmost importance, such as the pooling of power resources, the joint solution of the fuel and raw materials problem, various aspects of development in engineering and transport, the choice of the most suitable forms of monetary settlements, and scientific-technical cooperation.

It became obvious some time ago that if the progress of socialist countries was not to be a simple sum of their achievements (though these, too, are the result of cooperation), but an integral quantity resulting from these achievements and from the effect of the international division of labour, it would be essential to set in motion a comprehensive long-term programme of economic and scientific-technical integration, assuring dynamic and unintermittent cooperation.

The socialist economic integration programme is comprehensive, meaning that it encompasses not only the sphere of material production, science and technology, monetary and financial relations, foreign trade and transport, but also various aspects of management, planning, law, organisation and methodology.

It is also a long-term programme. It was adopted by the 25th session of CMEA for a term of 15-20 years, and envisages phased economic and organisational measures, which are to be carried out under a time-table with an eye on the interests of each country and those of the community as a whole.

"Bourgeois leaders often express surprise over the singleness of outlook among the countries of the socialist community," said A. N. Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, at the jubilee 28th session of CMEA. "It is difficult for them to understand, if only due to their bourgeois world outlook, why there are no 'crises' of confidence, clashes of interests or competitive struggles in our community. All these things, which are typical of the capitalist world, do not exist in our community because the relations between the fraternal socialist countries harmonise their national interests with international interests, and because they are based on the principles of socialist internationalism, principles of equality, sovereignty, and fraternal mutual assistance. These principles work in our community both in the national and the international frameworks."¹

It is envisaged in the Economic Guidelines for 1976-1980 adopted by the 25th CPSU Congress "to expand and deepen economic, scientific and technological cooperation with the socialist countries in every possible way, on the basis of mutual advantage and comradely mutual assistance. To ensure the fulfilment of measures, envisaged in the Comprehensive Programme of Socialist Economic Integration and the coordinated plan of multilateral integration measures of CMEA member-countries for 1976-80."²

¹ *Pravda*, June 20, 1974.

² *Guidelines for the Development of the National Economy of the USSR for 1976-1980*, p. 106.

Socialist economic integration is based on two interrelated tendencies—the consolidation of the national economic complexes, on the one hand, regress from the national economic frameworks and closer international ties, on the other. That is one of its distinctive features.

The closer international ties and fraternal friendship of the peoples of the socialist countries are also displayed in their broad exchanges of spiritual values. The mutual influence and enrichment of their cultures occurs in a variety of forms and at different levels. The respective unions of writers, artists and composers cooperate on a broad basis. So do the academies of sciences, universities and other institutions of higher learning. Books are translated extensively, and there are exchanges of films and TV programmes, and of theatre companies and other groups of performers.

The right correlation in the development of national and international processes consonant with socialism is not achieved automatically. Many of the difficulties and complications internationalism has to surmount are related to the national question.

“The overall tendency is unquestionably characterised by a growing cohesion of socialist countries,” the 25th CPSU Congress noted, adding: “We value this tendency highly, and shall, as before, promote it in every way.”¹

The emergence and development of the world socialist system is part of the class battle between socialism and capitalism. And for understandable reasons, the circumstances of this battle complicate the resolution by each people of the problems of national sovereignty and state independence. The powerful national liberation movement of the past decade has had a certain effect on the quickening of the national feelings of peoples in some of the socialist countries. And in its bid to change the balance of world forces in its favour, imperialism is trying very hard to disrupt the unity of the peoples of socialist countries by supporting nationalist tendencies.

It is only in recent years that the necessity for “harmonious national and international coordination of the social forms of

¹ *Report of the CPSU Central Committee and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy*, p. 11.

production",¹ predicted by Karl Marx, became fully apparent. Such coordination, as Lenin said, is contingent on the socialist countries' clear appreciation of the economic necessity of union. The objective need for an economic basis of world socialism spurs improvements in the division of labour among countries and, consequently, also a reversal of the earlier striving for all-encompassing versatility in the development of the national economic complexes.

The connection between socialist economic integration and the problem of national relations between socialist countries has proved much closer than was earlier assumed. This is why the CMEA session in the spring of 1969 stressed that integration would be based on the principles of state sovereignty, independence and free will. Socialist integration is to assure the further development of economic cooperation and the drawing together of the national economies of CMEA member-countries. This is in sharp contrast to capitalist integration, for example that of the Common Market, which is aimed at forming supra-national governing agencies. Hence, socialist integration does not impinge upon the internal economic life of the participating countries.

National relations are also affected by some of the peculiarities of the present stage of the class struggle: first, apart from class distinctions there is also a number of supporters of the old system and survivals of the old mentality in some of the socialist countries; second, ideology has become the most important battlefield of the class struggle between the old and new worlds, and national relations, in which the new takes a longer time to assert itself, are the centre of attention of the anti-socialist forces. Making the most of the remnants of national suspicion, mutual resentment and petty-bourgeois nationalist views inherited from the past, these forces encourage and fan nationalism. While seeking to undermine the pillars of socialism in each country, its enemies also employ nationalism to try and disrupt the unity of all the socialist countries. Furthermore, since the Soviet Union plays an especially big part in the development of the socialist community, nationalism often becomes anti-Sovietism.

¹ Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 17, S. 546.

A new type of international relations is emerging in the environment of the acute class struggle on the international scene and within some of the socialist-oriented countries. Soon after the October Revolution Lenin stressed that "the Bolsheviks are establishing completely different international relations" as compared with those of capitalist countries.¹ These relations repose on full equality, sovereignty and independence. What is no less important, the new type of international relations, as Lenin put it, made it "possible for all oppressed peoples to rid themselves of the imperialist yoke",² to secure real freedom of development for the smaller peoples. Yet it is the anti-socialist forces of precisely the smaller peoples who, with foreign imperialist support, are active pushers of nationalism, directing it against the principles of proletarian internationalism and their most faithful exponents—the Soviet Communist Party and the Soviet state. The anti-socialist press in Czechoslovakia, for example, averred that the national interests of the small countries had come into collision with "great-power ambitions garbed as proletarian internationalism".

Those who disguised their struggle against socialism with membership in the Communist Party, fought against proletarian internationalism by more subtle means. One of their ploys was to say that proletarian internationalism was an outdated concept. We haven't had a proletariat for years, maintained F. Kriegel, one of the Right opportunists. What we have are working people who have merged with the technical personnel, the engineers and the intellectuals, he said, and for them internationalism has no class content any longer. The internationalist policy of the Communist Party was speciously described by the anti-socialist forces in Czechoslovakia as an obstacle to socialist democracy. The *Literarni listi*, a newspaper known at that time for its counter-revolutionary posture, even wrote that "the Party will hardly be able to effect democratisation, for it must pursue not only a national but also an international policy". The Right opportunist and anti-socialist forces deliberately ignored the Marxist-Leninist tenet on the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 477.

² *Ibid.*

unity and indivisibility of the national and international tasks of the working class and its Party, divided and opposed these tasks to each other in order to propagate nationalism.

The search for the most effective and suitable ways of securing the victory of socialism in the various countries has become keener these days, and this, too, is more closely related to the national question than was previously assumed. Certainly, the search had begun much earlier; but only in the past 10 or 15 years it became clear that the working class and its Marxist-Leninist parties were not always sufficiently considerate of the specific features of their respective countries.

Conscious of its responsibility for the future of world socialism, the working class in the socialist countries has begun to devote more attention to the search for such ways of asserting socialism as would augment the achievements of the peoples and add to socialism's force of attraction for people in the capitalist and developing countries.

Naturally, the anti-socialist forces are trying to divert this search for ways of building socialism towards dissociation from the world socialist system, to give the process a nationalist complexion. It is for this end that they over-exaggerate national features and scorn the general laws of socialist construction.

One of the factors that increased the role of the national question in the life of the peoples of socialist countries is the accelerated development of the structure of the world socialist system. The human mind is not yet able to encompass the multiplicity and complexity of the processes generated by the activation of ever more new laws and regularities in the development of the world socialist system. So far we have seen only the first intimations of these processes: the natural course of events has put on the agenda such problems as the gradual elimination of distinctions between the national economic complexes and the formation of a single world socialist economy; a growing subordination of national processes to international processes; a gradual convergence of socialist nations and nationalities within the limits of the world socialist system.

And, understandably, the reaction of different sections of the population of socialist countries to the changes occurring

there, is not the same. Some of them, prodded by internal anti-socialist forces and outside imperialist influences, seek to preserve the previous situation at any price, including the use of nationalism, and, furthermore, to push individual countries towards exclusiveness and isolationism.

Another factor behind the greater significance of national relations in the system of social relations in general and the inter-state relations of socialist countries in particular, are the certain mistakes that occurred for purely subjective reasons during the shaping of the world socialist system and had in their day a negative effect on the relations between peoples. These mistakes were rectified a long time ago, their consequences have been overcome, but the anti-socialist forces still continue to exploit them.

Due to the greater role of the national question in the life of socialist countries at the present stage, there is also a certain increase in nationalist tendencies.

Bourgeois propaganda deliberately exaggerates the place and role of nationalism in the life of the peoples of the world socialist system. In fact, however, there is no cause to overestimate the danger of nationalism at the present time any more than there is for underrating the harm it has already inflicted and may still inflict. Manifestations of nationalism are a brake on the advance of world socialism. If not eradicated nationalism may take firmer hold. It will then be more difficult to combat. Lastly, manifestations of nationalism must be fought because, among other things, they upset the balance of the national and international processes that assures and accelerates the progress of society.

To fight nationalism consistently, we must know its nature and its different manifestations.

Upon replacing capitalism, socialism inherits definite productive forces, a variety of modes of production, and absurd and outdated national boundaries resulting from forcible and unjust demarcation and division and redivision of private property, natural wealth, and the like. This is one of the reasons why nationalism is also liable to surface after the establishment of proletarian dictatorship in such basic forms as a) remnants of bourgeois nationalism, b) petty-bourgeois nationalism and its remnants, and c) departures from the

natural development of the national consciousness and national relations due to the contradictory character of social development, subjectivist distortions, or mistakes.

After the victory of the socialist revolution, *bourgeois nationalism* as such can manifest itself only in the form of survivals or remnants. The most widespread form of these vestiges are prejudices based on the traditions of great-power chauvinism among members of larger nations that had dominated other peoples. Another survival that may occur in conditions of proletarian dictatorship is distrust by members of a formerly oppressed nation of the working people, of the nation that had oppressed them, especially if the distrust impels the wish of isolation, even secession from a multinational state or a community of states building socialism.

In the early years of Soviet power, Lenin observed survivals of bourgeois nationalism even among certain theoretically and politically unstable communists. Calling for the unity of the working people of all nationalities in the battle against home and foreign counter-revolution and introducing centralisation, which was essential for this, communists of Russian origin were sometimes motivated not only by the interests of the revolution, but also "the prejudices of the old Great-Russian nationalism".¹ This did not surprise Lenin, because, he said, "the Great-Russians, under the yoke of the landowners and capitalists, had for centuries imbibed the shameful and disgusting prejudices of Great-Russian chauvinism".² The reaction to such behaviour was distrust on the part of Communists of the formerly oppressed national outlands, and their suspicion, too, was rooted in the prejudices and traditions of old. Such mistrust, Lenin explained, was also "natural, and to a certain degree inevitable and legitimate".³

It follows that working people can also be bearers of survivals and remnants of bourgeois nationalism. Besides, there are still survivors of the overthrown exploiting classes, sometimes quite numerous. So are the intellectuals, former officials and bureaucrats, etc., who had served them. This

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 295.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

group is definitely anti-socialist and nationalist in make-up. Employed in offices, institutions and enterprises of the proletarian state they may want to use their job to assert their views and sentiments.

Petty-bourgeois nationalism is, under proletarian dictatorship, a socially, ideologically and psychologically more complicated phenomenon. Prior to the victory of socialism it is at once a survival of the old in people's minds, and a product of a definite social background.

Small-scale commodity production had predominated at the time of the socialist revolution in Russia and in most of the other now socialist countries. Apart from the working peasants, comprising the bulk of the petty-bourgeois masses, there also remained kulaks for a certain time, and in the towns and cities a fairly substantial stratum of artisans, shopkeepers, and even owners of private enterprises. Though, as Lenin put it, it was "quite clear to everyone that it is absolutely impossible to maintain or retain petty-bourgeois positions" after "socialism has entered the period of its realisation",¹ petty-bourgeois elements kept hoping, and their hopes grew over into struggle against the consolidation of socialism. This struggle was fought largely under the nationalist flag. Joining hands with other anti-socialist forces, they used nationalism as one of the main weapons in the bid to keep their positions.

For a time, petty-bourgeois nationalism exists on its own social basis; but it also feeds on survivals of capitalism in people's minds. This means that it has a grip on a part of the people; it becomes their ideology, and surfaces in social relations and psychology.

National egoism is central to the structure of petty-bourgeois nationalism, though admittedly it manifests itself not only on a petty-bourgeois basis. A distorted reflection of the life of a people, embodied in ideology and psychology, it becomes the reason for exaggerations of national to the disadvantage of international interests, and for gross disregard of the national interests of other peoples. National exclusiveness and narrow-mindedness are the forms in which national egoism manifests itself.

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 28, p. 335.

There are several reasons why petty-bourgeois nationalism is especially dangerous in the conditions of proletarian dictatorship. To begin with, its exponents do not openly oppose the socialist system; on the contrary, they take advantage of its democracy to conceal their subversive activity among the masses. Moreover, there may be elements of democratism in its content as a reaction to possible violations of national interests and national dignity. In other words, it may have a social basis in the form of a more or less substantial section of the petty-bourgeois masses and serve as their ideology, and materialise in the consciousness, psychology and social practice. This is due to the fact that in the first years of the proletarian dictatorship it is difficult completely to rule out offences against national interests and national feelings (insufficiently rapid development of the national economy or culture, not always mutually beneficial exchanges with other peoples, cases of other nations—especially the former oppressor nations—showing their dislike or even chauvinism, and so on). Petty-bourgeois nationalism in this form is, of course, not a derivative of socialism but an aftermath of the old system—the pre-socialist modes of production, the proprietorial interests of the petty-bourgeois masses, and in general survivals of capitalism in the consciousness, life style and traditions. As an element of social consciousness, as an ideology, the policy and social practice of part of the population, petty-bourgeois nationalism may occur only during the period of transition from the capitalist or pre-capitalist forms of society to socialism, and this only as a temporary deviation from socialism under the influence of petty-bourgeois licentiousness on the working class in power. Combining with great-power traditions and hegemonism, it may also manifest itself as out-and-out jingoism. Its more usual forms, however, are neutralism and a predilection for only national, invariably falsely conceived, interests; covert or overt disregard of the international tasks; departures from proletarian internationalism in theory and practice.

In the conditions of victorious socialism, nationalism cannot be a more or less systematic ideology of a definite class or stratum, of its policy and social practice, because no such classes or strata exist any longer. Here, manifestations of

nationalism are possible mainly in the domain of consciousness, and that only among an insignificant segment of people. In the sphere of politics and social practice, they are possible only in relations between individuals.

Manifestations of nationalism are of different origin: a) legacies of the past in the social structure, national psychology, way of life, and traditions; b) outside influences of an ideological kind or as the effect of social practices in other countries; c) contradictions in the development of society and subjectivist distortions of the course of this development, such as voluntarism and mistakes in theory and practice.

Marx, Engels and Lenin pointed out that the aftermaths of the old system must be taken into account in socialist construction, and especially in consolidating world socialism. Marx and Engels called attention to the fact that socialism will be built by people burdened with legacies of the past in the form of survivals, prejudices, and reactionary traditions. Marx once said that old traditions impose themselves like a nightmare on the minds of the living. This is particularly apparent in the sphere of national relations.

Lenin called attention to the harm of nationalism as a legacy of the past. He said: "The urgency of the struggle against this evil, against the most deep-rooted petty-bourgeois national prejudices, looms ever larger with the mounting exigency of the task of converting the dictatorship of the proletariat from a national dictatorship (i.e., existing in a single country and incapable of determining world politics) into an international one (i.e., a dictatorship of the proletariat involving at least several advanced countries, and capable of exercising a decisive influence upon world politics as a whole)."¹

This leads to a number of conclusions relevant to socialist construction in individual countries and to the consolidation of world socialism in general. To begin with, Lenin names the national consciousness and psychology as the main spheres where this evil legacy comes to the surface. The nutritive medium of nationalism is also defined: apart from survivals of the past in people's consciousness, apart from national feelings, Lenin points to elements of the old in the social structure,

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 148.

notably the long survival of petty-bourgeois masses. He stresses that neglect of the social, ideological and psychological consequences of drawing backward countries into building socialism may have a particularly negative effect. Because, he says, "the more backward the country, the stronger is the hold of small-scale agricultural production, patriarchalism and isolation, which inevitably lend particular strength and tenacity to the deepest of petty-bourgeois prejudices, i.e., to national egoism and national narrow-mindedness".¹ At the same time Lenin said that apart from survivals in the consciousness and psychology, the long survival of petty-bourgeois masses and, evidently, of anti-socialist forces in general (remnants of the overthrown exploiting classes and the allegiance to the old system of part of the national intelligentsia), these prejudices will also be rooted in the capitalist system existing in some countries. The prejudices of national egoism and national narrow-mindedness can recede into the past only after: a) the disappearance of imperialism and capitalism in the developed countries; and b) radical alterations in the economic life of backward countries. Therefore Lenin wrote that these prejudices will be dying agonisingly slow.

In sum, the temporary survival of a social basis for the germination of new manifestations of nationalism can also be a source of nationalism. These new manifestations may originate from the influence of the still existing capitalist world on the backward part of the population infected with survivals of capitalism of a general nature (individualism, preference for private ownership, and the like). Even the social practice in socialist countries that fail to adhere strictly and consistently enough to the socialist way, may also have a negative effect. There is, for example, the negative influence on some countries of the ideology and practice of "national communism".

For all the importance of exposing the breeding-ground for nationalism in socialist society in the case of both the first and second sources, that is, the heritage of the past and the outside influences, the "mechanics" of its manifestations is the same and is relatively easy to understand. Far more complicated is

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 150.

the third source—manifestations of nationalism without a social basis in the structure of society and without direct survivals of nationalism in the consciousness of the people, merely as a result of contradictions in the development of society under socialism, of subjectivist distortions of the natural course of this development due to its erroneous theoretical and political assessment, inability or reluctance to establish the correct correlation of national and international interests and tasks, etc.

The development of national forms and changes in the social content of the progress of peoples occur at different rates. Generally, form is more conservative than content. Moreover, we are here dealing with national form, associated with such very slowly changing factors as language, national culture, national character, and the like, that is, chiefly with the ethnic in the national. The social content, on the other hand, is chiefly related to the growth of the productive forces and the relations of production, which change at a relatively higher rate.

One of the contradictions in the development of society under socialism stems from differences between the content of the scientific-theoretical consciousness and the everyday consciousness and the forms in which they manifest themselves. These differences merit attention, because they result in subjective interpretations of such complex social phenomena as the correlation of the class and national elements, of the international and the national.

The conflicting nature of society's development has a strong bearing on nationalist manifestations under socialism because of subjectivist distortions, sometimes even mistakes, in the policy of the working class and its party concerning the national question. The reasons for these distortions and mistakes may differ. In some cases it is a nihilistic attitude to the national features of peoples, to the Leninist requirement of special tact and consideration for national feelings, the historical past of peoples, their national customs and traditions. In other cases, individuals may, even under socialism, violate the elementary rules of equality and free will, undermining the confidence of peoples, lacking which there can be neither peaceful relations nor progress.

Just as in the above cases, many other things deriving from

subjectivist distortions and mistakes may be traced to neglect of proletarian, socialist internationalism. Any departure from it, even in the most elementary matters—such as observing factual rather than formal equality—leads, according to Lenin, to petty-bourgeois postures and may even cause a drift to bourgeois postures.

The big share (now or in the recent past) of petty-bourgeois elements in the population of some countries that took the socialist way as a result of the second stage of the general crisis of capitalism, is another important factor affecting the development of the world socialist system. Despite the substantial changes in the class structure of society, the petty-bourgeois masses, their ideology, have a retarding effect on the building of socialism.

It is a special feature of the socialist revolution in some countries that, despite all the malignancy of nationalism, it helped to draw certain groups of the petty-bourgeoisie and intelligentsia into the struggle for the overthrow of the old system, because their urge for national independence was stronger than the knowledge that it would bring closer the victory of socialist revolution. The revolution triumphed in a setting where the national bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeois, chiefly peasant, masses not only assisted in its victory but also participated in governing the country—through their parties, a united popular front, or in some other way.

The passage of a number of countries of the present-day world socialist system to the building of the new society, especially if the working class is weak, entails the danger that the people's national consciousness will develop one-sidedly. That it should grow is natural, because it is spurred by legitimate pride for successes in the struggle against enemies and in building the new life. But if national pride, and national consciousness in general, grows in an environment where petty-bourgeois elements predominate, while the working class cannot for one reason or another control it, there may be an inflation of national prejudices and pride will grow into vanity, which, in turn, may in certain circumstances assume the proportions of nationalism and chauvinism. Something like this happened in some of the national areas of the Soviet Union. Suffice it to recall that M. Sultan-Galiyev in Tataria,

B. Mdivani in Georgia, A. Shumsky in the Ukraine and other officials in constituent and autonomous Soviet republics, who were contaminated with the germ of nationalism, were not alone in their thinking; in some cases their views even grew into ideological platforms for deviations in the national question. It was only thanks to the maturity of the working class and its party, to the leadership of the great Lenin, that they could be nipped in the bud. In some socialist countries the working class and its party proved incapable of directing the development of the people's national consciousness and themselves fell under the spell of petty-bourgeois nationalist ideology.

There is yet another reason why nationalist tendencies may surface in a country on the socialist way with a large petty-bourgeois population. It is up to the Communist Party, Lenin said, to apply the general principles of communism to the *peculiar* relationship of classes and parties, to the *peculiar* objective development towards communism typical of the country in question. It is also essential to find the right correlation of these national peculiarities and the general laws of the socialist revolution and socialist construction. But that takes a high degree of political maturity and experience on the part of the proletarian party. "Every country," Lenin wrote, "contributes its own valuable and specific features to the common stream; but in each particular country the movement suffers from its own one-sidedness, its own theoretical and practical shortcomings of the individual socialist parties."¹

Exaggeration of local peculiarities and advocacy of one or another form of so-called national communism are most dangerous if they prevail in the approach to the problems of socialist construction. When the building of socialism began in some of the People's Democracies, elements in fact opposed to proletarian dictatorship became active, even inside the Communist parties. Typically, they tried to conceal their attempts at stalling socialist construction with vows of fidelity to Marxism-Leninism. But they did make one "qualification": it is up to every people, they maintained, to pick its own particular "national" road to socialism. And though their real purpose

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 187.

was to stall socialism, the cohesion of the anti-socialist forces was achieved through nationalism, which thereby gained the support of a section of unstable members of individual Communist parties. At the same time, with the cold war unfolding across the world against the socialist forces, there also appeared the first intimations of "neutralism" and of demands of the kind of "equality" that clearly meant inequality for others.

One of the essential reasons for the gravitation towards "national communism" was the penetration of petty-bourgeois elements into Communist parties, coupled with insufficient political maturity and experience of leading Party cadres.

Many participants in the 1969 Meeting called attention to cases of glaring right and "left" opportunism in both theory and practice. The 24th and 25th CPSU Congresses, too, stressed that in the world communist movement struggle against anticommunism and anti-Sovietism, against right and "left" revisionism, and against nationalism, was still an important task.

Lenin emphasised observance of the equality of peoples. There is nothing to which the peoples are more sensitive, he pointed out, than violations of equality, even if inadvertent, even in the form of a joke. Yet in some socialist countries there sometimes appear historical and literary works that, in fact, exalt their history while injuring the national dignity of other fraternal peoples.

The unity of the world socialist system can be harmed not only by outright manifestations of nationalism. The slightest lapse in mutual consideration of national interests is also impermissible. Especially now, when economic reforms are under way in a number of countries to improve the national economic system, and when the CMEA countries are on the way to socialist economic integration. It is essential to consider the social consequences of the economic reforms, and also their effect on the correlation of the national and international. The right balance between them must be preserved.

No matter what guise nationalism may adopt, the nationalist ideology is hostile to socialism, because even if it manifests itself as merely a survival of the past, it retains the main principle of bourgeois nationalism—propagation of national exclusive-

ness—which is sure to lead to isolation, dissociation, and a weakening of the world socialist system. That is the substance of the social consequences of nationalism. The harm nationalism inflicts on the common cause of liberation is just as great, because it blunts the influence of the world socialist system on the general course of mankind's development. It discredits socialist ideas among millions of working people still under capitalist rule or only just relieved of colonial oppression.

The cause of the working class and all other working people is harmed equally by those who advocate nationalism as an ingredient of a programme of "liberalising" socialism and those who take cover behind "left", quasi-revolutionary rhetoric.

Nothing but socialist internationalism can strengthen the world socialist system and overcome the divisive consequences of the remnants of the nationalist ideology.

Under socialism, the assurance of a country's national unity is a manifestation of internationalism. But to achieve such unity is not easy. We were absolutely right, Lenin said, not to have made any concessions to petty-bourgeois democracy. "We had to disperse the petty-bourgeois illusion," he wrote, "that the people are an integral whole and that the popular will can be expressed other than in class struggle."¹ The difficulty of securing national unity in Soviet Russia was aggravated by the fact that by concluding the Brest Peace the Bolshevik Party had had to go against the patriotism of the petty-bourgeois masses, against those who did not understand that Russia's working class could not sacrifice the interests of the world revolution to narrow national interests.

In the People's Democracies the conditions were somewhat different. In contrast to the Soviet Union, alliance with the entire mass of middle strata was possible from the moment socialist transformations were launched. Yet in a number of cases it took some time before the workers' class interests became the basis for national unity. For all its impact, the ideology of proletarian internationalism spread very slowly to the different groups of the petty-bourgeoisie, which Lenin described as less mobile than the workers, still less connected

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 207.

with other peoples, and the most deeply infected with nationalist survivals. There was also a certain underestimation of the national processes, which, among other things, reflected on the situation of some of the national minorities, and on the work with the intelligentsia. All this was exploited by the anti-socialist forces in Hungary in 1956 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968, who advocated the slogan of "national unity" as a unity based on nationalism and anti-Sovietism. This is why after overcoming the counter-revolutionary forces the foremost task of the Communists in Hungary and Czechoslovakia was to achieve national unity on a truly proletarian basis. In Hungary, this has already been accomplished. "Our progress over the past twelve years," wrote Zoltan Komocsin, member of the Political Bureau, HSWP, in the autumn of 1968, "has brought into being a new national unity, with a socialist content and aims that accord with the Communist Party programme."¹ The government report of March 1973, too, specially stressed "the growing socialist national unity" of the Hungarian people.²

The socialist national unity of the Czechs and Slovaks in Czechoslovakia, too, is being successfully promoted.

For all the importance of the national aspects in the development of the world socialist system and the international working-class movement, correct definition and solution of the problems of proletarian internationalism is of primary significance. Sometimes, the struggle for the monolithic unity of nations on the basis of socialism is taking place in a strained situation. For this reason, political workers and scholars in the socialist countries now pay considerable attention to the problems of internationalism, showing the necessity for the closest possible unity between the propagation in practice of the principles of internationalism and patriotism, and ideological work.

And yet at the end of the 1960s there surfaced unacceptable views concerning the principles of internationalism. Mainly, this refers to attempts to prove, purportedly on a Marxist-Leninist basis, that the content of our epoch tends to weaken

¹ *World Marxist Review*, 1968, No. 10-11, p. 9.

² *Népszabadság*, 1973, március 22.

the effectiveness and to narrow the content of proletarian internationalism. Even now there are those who believe that the degree of maturity achieved by the Communist parties and the present development level of the socialist countries make it possible to dispense with mutual ties and mutual support. Hence, it is inferred, the "principle of autonomy" rather than proletarian internationalism can now be the "supreme principle" of their mutual relations. This idea, based on the petty-bourgeois conception of sovereignty and independence, interprets the interests and aspirations of peoples in a narrow national context and ignores the interests and needs of world socialism.

Also politically harmful is the idea that since various anti-imperialist forces have joined the struggle for progress alongside the socialist countries and the working class, the ideology of proletarian internationalism, let alone socialist internationalism (which is confined only to the world socialist system), has become "too narrow". What is offered instead is "internationalism of the anti-imperialist, peace-loving, democratic forces".

On the surface, the proposal may appear harmless. But what it means is that an integral and clear ideology, that of proletarian internationalism, should be dissolved in the sentiments and emotions of a heterogeneous mass of fighters against imperialism and war, thereby weakening the influence and leading role of the international working class. Yet leadership by the international working class, the 1969 International Meeting stressed, is the earnest of the victory of the anti-imperialist front. The working class is the principal mobilising force of the revolutionary struggle, of the entire democratic anti-imperialist movement. It is unnecessary, therefore, to revise the concept of proletarian internationalism. What is necessary is to spread its influence outside the world socialist system and the international working-class movement, and first of all in the national-liberation and all other democratic movements.

Even the mere consent to any revision of the content of proletarian internationalism as defined by the classics of Marxism-Leninism is, in the present conditions, a concession to the revisionists and opportunists.

The experience of some countries has shown that in the process of building and developing socialism, the resistance of the anti-socialist forces has three specific features:

- it is accompanied by efforts to inflate nationalism and disrupt the fraternal relations between the peoples of the socialist countries;

- while formally supporting socialism, the hostile forces lay the main accent on giving it a "national" complexion, that is, on isolating socialist construction in each country, and thus enfeebling it;

- using diverse forms of struggle against socialism, including covert alliance with international imperialism, the anti-socialist forces build up petty-bourgeois pressure on the working class and its Marxist-Leninist parties, seeking to substitute philistine nationalism for internationalism.

In a number of cases, the pressure of the anti-socialist forces developed into undisguised attempts to overthrow the socialist system with the help of international imperialism. Also there were attempts to impose on the working people, on the Marxist-Leninist parties, a distorted conception of the place and role of the national question in present-day society, and, first and foremost, a distorted conception of the content and forms of socialist internationalism.

There have been some obvious departures from the Marxist-Leninist teaching in interpreting the essence of the development of nations and national relations. This applies first of all to the erroneous opinion that there are, both subjectively and objectively, grounds for substantial differences, collisions, and acute national contradictions under socialism in general, and not only in the concrete conditions now prevailing in the world socialist system. Precisely this view is at the root of oversensitive reactions to attempts at finding ways of further drawing together the socialist countries, and of negative responses to the proposals of implementing the first measures leading to the integration of national economic complexes.

Interpretations of the essence of the development of nations and national relations contrary to Marxism-Leninism undermine the unity of socialist countries, slow down their development and, consequently, diminish the influence of the world

socialist system on the rest of the world. However, "unity of the nation" achieved by substituting internationalism in word for internationalism in deed invariably tends to strengthen petty-bourgeois nationalism and to undermine the foundations of socialism.

The importance of internationalism for world socialism was emphatically stressed by the 1969 International Meeting. Summarising the standpoint of its participants, and expressing the CPSU's complete acceptance of this standpoint, Leonid Brezhnev said that "the main direction in cementing the socialist system is steadfastly to implement the principles of socialist internationalism, correctly combine the national and international tasks of socialist countries and promote fraternal mutual assistance and support between them on the basis of consistent observance of the equality of all socialist countries, of their sovereignty and independence and of non-interference in their internal affairs".¹

The world socialist system is performing its internationalist duty to mankind with eminent success. On drawing this conclusion, the Meeting also outlined the main areas in which the ideology of socialist internationalism is being put into practice. To begin with, the world socialist system is blazing unexplored trails in building classless society. Further, it has not only given mankind the perspective of deliverance from imperialism, but is itself in the decisive sector of the struggle against it. Faithful to their international duty, the socialist countries are rendering peoples fighting for freedom and independence ever increasing assistance, and are working for international peace and security.

Isolated departures from the Marxist-Leninist principles of internationalism stem not simply from disregard of international processes, but also from obvious neglect of the aggregate of national processes. As a result, propaganda of internationalism becomes empty rhetoric, because its principles are not tied in with the basis—the international and national processes. Due to disregard of these processes, the opportunities for guiding them in the conditions of the socialist system, are often left unused. This, in turn, pushes what is specifically national

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, pp. 167-68.

to the foreground. As a result, the international processes do not get the fertile soil they require, that is, the development of general and universal elements in the national processes. Naturally, this tends to strengthen the nationalist elements penetrating the ranks of the working class and its party.

In 1968 in Czechoslovakia, for example, there was clear evidence of deficient internationalist education in the preceding two decades, of insufficient skill on the part of the Party organisations to secure a correct understanding by the masses of the correlation of patriotism and internationalism, coupled with underestimation of nationalist survivals and of the reactionary elements' ability to use them. "Reactionary trends of all kinds," Gustav Husák said, "merged into a stream of bourgeois nationalism, regarding which Lenin said that it represented the greatest danger to the working-class movement. Instead of dialectically combining socialist patriotism with proletarian internationalism, these values were metaphysically counterposed. The emphasis was solely on national features. There emerged the theory about an exclusively Czechoslovak 'model of socialism with a human face'."¹

In the present situation, the working class and the Marxist-Leninist parties of the socialist countries bear a special responsibility for the future of world socialism. Mindful of the objective laws of social development, Lenin gave top priority to the unity of all socialist states. He linked the content and forms of state relations between socialist countries with the process of internationalisation in general, and the shaping of a single world economy in particular.

While stressing the leading role of the internationalisation processes, Lenin pointed out that in modern conditions human progress was also embodied in the all-round development of national processes. Whereas in their revolutionary strategy of transforming society the working class and its party should proceed from international processes to achieve serious progress, he held, they must take full account of national processes in their tactics.

It is more important than ever to rise above feelings of national exclusiveness, to remember Lenin's words that anyone

¹ *World Marxist Review*, January 1970, No. 1, p. 3.

espousing nationalism will inevitably want to surround himself with a Chinese Wall. In such cases, internationalism is seen one-sidedly, and one draws on it only for what it can yield, without the least thought of one's own international duty. Lenin described such internationalism as "nothing but empty words".¹ Naturally, an incorrect conception of the content of internationalism leads to an incorrect conception of the essence of nationalism, which is seen as something that exists only under capitalism and represents oppression of other peoples.

Lenin called on the internationalists to oppose all nationalism. He called on them to "fight *against* small-nation narrow-mindedness, seclusion and isolation, consider the whole and the general, subordinate the particular to the general interest".² This some people tend to forget. Just as they forget what elements actually comprise the concept of internationalism. They are liable to swear allegiance to socialist internationalism, to maintain that there is no trace of nationalism in their policy. But when asked if they are performing their international duty, they can only reply that they are concerned with the well-being of their people, the flowering of their country. For Lenin, internationalism was not only persistent struggle for liberation and happiness of his own country, but also support of "(by propaganda, sympathy, and material aid) *this struggle*, *this, and only this*, line, in *every* country without exception".³

The activity of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is a model of internationalism. True to the legacy of the great Lenin, said Leonid Brezhnev, our Party "*has always striven to make full use of all inner potentialities to strengthen and promote socialism and communism to the utmost in the Soviet Union and, at the same time, to support and develop the revolutionary struggle throughout the world*".⁴

Sometimes, the danger of nationalist tendencies subverting internationalism surfaces in socialist countries facing a difficult climb from backwardness to progress, where the working class is insufficiently steered. In those conditions internationalism

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 148.

² *Ibid.*, p. 347.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 24, p. 75.

⁴ L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 219.

may be accepted in word and replaced with nationalism in deed; then the struggle for the principles of internationalism becomes long and acute. This results if proletarian internationalism is interpreted solely as observance of equality in relations or even solely as performance of the national duty, while the international is neglected.

This conception is contrary to the main purpose of proletarian internationalism: consolidation of unity. It leads to division and fragmentation of the progressive forces, thus reducing to nil, as Lenin said, "the great call for the rallying and unity of the proletarians of all nations, all races and all languages".¹ This is why Lenin's assessment (in 1920) of nationalist prejudices and their negative influence on the internationalist character of the proletarian dictatorship in a growing number of countries, rings so true today: "Petty-bourgeois nationalism proclaims as internationalism the mere recognition of the equality of nations, and nothing more," he said. "Quite apart from the fact that this recognition is purely verbal, petty-bourgeois nationalism preserves national self-interest intact, whereas proletarian internationalism demands, first, that the interests of the proletarian struggle in any one country should be subordinated to the interests of that struggle on a worldwide scale, and, second, that a nation which is achieving victory over the bourgeoisie should be able and willing to make the greatest national sacrifices for the overthrow of international capital."²

If I am an internationalist, Lenin said, "I must argue, not from the point of view of 'my' country (for that is the argument of a wretched, stupid, petty-bourgeois nationalist ...), but from the point of view of *my share* in the preparation, in the propaganda, and in the acceleration of the world proletarian revolution."³ In the present conditions this means that the Communist parties, while concerned with their country's socialist development, must not forget that strengthening the world socialist system—the foundation of the victorious growth of the entire world revolutionary process, of the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 521.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 148.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 28, p. 287.

world's passage from capitalism to socialism—holds the top priority.

In their 1957 Declaration, the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries said that even the principles of equality, territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty, and non-interference in the internal affairs of each other did not wholly cover the essence of relations between the socialist countries. Fraternal mutual assistance has become part and parcel of their relations and serves as the fullest and the most effective expression of the principles of socialist internationalism.

Underestimation of mutual assistance and the common responsibility for the future of world socialism as principles of internationalism reflected on the attitude of certain quarters to the August 1968 events in Czechoslovakia, and on their conception of the essence of proletarian internationalism in the present conditions. It will be recalled that following the entry of allied troops into Czechoslovakia there was an outcry in many countries, ostensibly in defence of the national sovereignty and national independence of the Czechs and Slovaks. At the head of the campaign stood world reaction. And, certainly, there could be nothing in common between reactionary designs and defence of socialism or, for that matter, of national sovereignty. But when sincere friends of socialism, even Communists, took the pose of defending Czechoslovakia's national sovereignty allegedly violated by the troops of other socialist countries, there is every reason to discuss the matter in order to show the fallacy of this viewpoint, and also in order to avoid the harmful consequences it may entail.

The socialist countries proclaimed the principles of national sovereignty and non-interference in each other's internal life to assure the victory of socialism, and certainly not for hostile forces to use them for undermining socialism. National sovereignty is not a thing in itself. It is based on the gains of socialism, and must serve its consolidation. Conversely, defence of the gains of socialism signifies defence of national sovereignty, of genuine national independence.

The appeal of the governments of the five socialist countries to the citizens of Czechoslovakia stressed specially that the

soldiers of the allied countries are class brothers who had come to Czechoslovakia "in order jointly with you to repulse counter-revolution, to defend the socialist cause and eliminate the threat to the sovereignty, independence and security of your fatherland".¹ Leonid Brezhnev pointed out that the socialist states stood for full respect of the national sovereignty of all countries, and that for Communists special significance attached to asserting and defending the sovereignty of states building socialism. He said: "The forces of imperialism and reaction are out to rob the people now of one, now of another socialist country of the sovereign right which they have won to ensure their country's prosperity, the good and happiness of the broad working masses, by building up a society free from all oppression and exploitation. And when encroachments upon that right meet with a unanimous rebuff on the part of the countries of the socialist camp, bourgeois propagandists raise a hue and cry about 'defence of sovereignty' and 'non-interference'. It is clear that this is pure deception and demagoguery on their part. In actual fact these bawlers are concerned not with the preservation of socialist sovereignty, but its destruction."²

The entry of allied troops was necessitated by the facts, the interests of world socialism. This could not go counter to the national interests of the Czechoslovak people. Furthermore, it followed from the bilateral treaties of the socialist countries, and from the provisions of the Warsaw Treaty. Last but not least, it was directly conditioned by the Bratislava statement, which, with the common consent of the leaders of the Soviet Union, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, and the GDR, on the one hand, and representatives of Czechoslovakia, on the other, specifically, and precisely in view of the threat to the socialist gains in Czechoslovakia, emphasised the *common* responsibility of all socialist countries for the fate of the gains of world socialism.

The text of the Bratislava statement reads: "Support, strengthening and defence of these gains, made at the price of heroic efforts, the selfless labour of every people, is the

¹ *Pravda*, August 24, 1968.

² L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, pp. 144-45.

common international duty of all the socialist countries. Such is the unanimous opinion of all the participants in the Conference, who expressed their unbending determination to develop and defend the socialist gains in their countries, and to work for new successes in the building of socialism."¹

The sincere and friendly assistance of the USSR, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria and the GDR to the people of Czechoslovakia was not a violation of its national sovereignty, but genuinely fraternal defence of that sovereignty, performance of the supreme international duty of the peoples of the socialist community. Can anyone say that the action of the five socialist countries was directed against the national statehood or territorial integrity of Czechoslovakia, or against the foundations of working people's power, or that anyone had impinged upon the country's wealth?

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia made a convincing retort to all the charges against the socialist countries in its December 1970 document, "Lessons of the Crisis Development in the CP of Czechoslovakia and in Society After the 13th CPC Congress". It said: "The entry of the allied troops of the five socialist countries into Czechoslovakia was an act of internationalist solidarity which accorded with the common interests of the Czechoslovak working people, the international working class and the socialist community, and the class interests of the world Communist movement. This internationalist action saved the lives of thousands of people, ensured internal and external conditions for their peaceful and calm work, strengthened the western border of the socialist camp, and destroyed the plans of the imperialists for revising the results of the second world war."² Gustav Husák, First Secretary of the CC CPC, stressed in his message of greeting to the 24th CPSU Congress that the internationalist assistance of the five socialist countries "saved our country from civil war and counter-revolution and helped us to uphold the gains of socialism".³

¹ *Pravda*, August 4, 1968.

² *New Times*, No. 4, 1971, p. 43.

³ *Our Friends Speak*, p. 93.

In some socialist countries the cases of disregard of proletarian internationalism in connection with the Czechoslovak events are traceable mainly to a tendency towards conciliation with petty-bourgeois nationalism, to a policy conducive to its survival and consolidation. Sometimes neglect of the basic principles of proletarian internationalism stems from the difference in the content of the tasks facing Communists in capitalist and socialist countries, and from dissimilar ideas about the degree of their responsibility for the future of world socialism.

For the Communist parties in capitalist countries, for example, the accent in the content of internationalism is chiefly centred on *solidarity* with the workers' class struggle against capitalist rule, and on moral and political support of the socialist countries, while for the Marxist-Leninist parties of the socialist countries the main emphasis has long been on *mutual assistance* in socialist and communist construction, defence of socialist gains, and joint responsibility for the future of world socialism.

The CPSU Central Committee noted the steadfast performance by the Communist Party of its international duty of consolidating the world socialist system. "The CPSU," said its resolution, "conceives its priority task to lie in working persistently for the closer cohesion and strengthening of the friendship of the Soviet people with the peoples of other socialist countries, and the comprehensive broadening of political, economic, ideological and cultural relations between them."¹

The importance of the efforts of the CPSU and the Soviet Government to strengthen the positions of the world socialist system should be specially stressed, because the need for cohesion and the closest possible cooperation of the socialist countries has not decreased. Quite the contrary. In his report on the 50th anniversary of the USSR, Leonid Brezhnev said: "Today we require unity, cooperation and joint action chiefly in order to accomplish more quickly and effectively the tasks of developing socialist society and building communism.

¹ *On Preparations for the 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*. Resolution of the CC CPSU, p. 21.

Moreover, we require unity, cohesion and cooperation in order to safeguard and consolidate the peace, so vital for all the peoples, as successfully as possible, to carry forward the international détente, and to effectively repulse all aggressive sallies of the imperialists, all attempts to impinge on the interests of socialism."¹

The convergence of the socialist countries is gaining in pace and scale. This the Communist and Workers' Parties consider to be the main trend in the development of the world socialist system. The process is based on the objective necessity of international cooperation among peoples building a classless society, on the will of the working class and all working people in the socialist countries, on the scientific guidance of the Marxist-Leninist parties, and on the world socialist system's increasing influence on the social progress of mankind.

2. INFLUENCE OF THE WORLD SOCIALIST SYSTEM ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONS AND NATIONAL RELATIONS IN THE MODERN WORLD

The 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties noted that the victory of the October Revolution, the building of socialism in the USSR and socialism's clear superiority over capitalism in the Second World War, the emergence and development of the world socialist system, and the inspiration socialism arouses in the whole world "have created the prerequisites for accelerating historical progress and opened new prospects for the advance and triumph of socialism throughout the world".² A tremendous influence is exercised by the socialist world on the solution of national problems arising in the international working-class and national liberation movements.

The foreign policy of the socialist countries is aimed at not only assuring favourable conditions for the building of

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, p. 43.

² *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969*, p. 21.

socialism and communism, but also at facilitating the development of the world revolutionary process. The latter objective is, among other things, benefited by the world socialist system's persevering struggle for peace. The link between the struggle for peace and the national question was stressed by the 1969 International Meeting, which pointed out that peaceful coexistence "demands observance of the principles of sovereignty, equality, territorial inviolability of every state, big and small, and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, respect for the rights of every people freely to decide their social, economic and political system, and the settlement of outstanding international issues by political means through negotiation".¹

For the working class and all working people in the developed capitalist countries, the world socialist system, especially the Soviet Union, is the foundation that they can lean upon in advancing their countries, in defending national independence against foreign monopolies, and using various aspects of the national question within the country and its relations with other peoples for forming a political army and assuring the victory of the revolution.

Still greater is the world socialist system's importance for the national liberation of the peoples of colonies and dependent countries.

The socialist world has secured a balance of forces that enabled oppressed peoples to tear down the colonial system and greatly advance the cause of national and social liberation. This is its most conspicuous contribution to the solution of the national question in the present stage. The socialist countries are a dependable support for peoples flinging off the colonial yoke. Developments have confirmed Lenin's idea that the liberation of colonies "cannot be effected without a number of revolutions and is not stable without socialism".² The socialist world helps to win liberation and to consolidate victory. The experience of the socialist countries demonstrates the vital necessity of seeking the final solution to backwardness and the problems of development precisely along socialist lines.

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969*, p. 31.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 337.

History has confirmed what Lenin said more than 50 years ago, namely, that "a socialist Soviet Republic in Russia will stand as a living example to the peoples of all countries, and the propaganda and revolutionising effect of this example will be immense".¹

The forms in which the world socialist system influences the national problems of the rest of mankind and the world revolutionary process, are of a very wide range. The experience of the Soviet Communist Party, of all the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries in settling the national question should, of course, be of major significance for the international working-class and national liberation movements. Referring to the resolution of the national question by the CPSU and its significance for the liberation struggle against imperialism Victor Perlo, the US Marxist scholar, said that the establishment of genuine national equality in the USSR had a decisive bearing on the growth of the anti-imperialist struggle in Asian and African countries. William Kashtan, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Canada, wrote in the autumn of 1972 that the 50th anniversary of the USSR was of special significance for the working people of Canada. He stressed further that the Soviet Union is the model of how to solve the national question and regulate national relations.²

The experience of the peoples of socialist countries is marked by the fact that the entire mass of working people was involved in the struggle for national and social liberation. This is very important for examining the processes under way in the developing countries. Despite the all-national character of the revolutions that brought them political liberation from colonial oppression and resulted in the formation of national states, the popular masses are in many cases far removed from government and have practically no say in their own future. This may be illustrated by the military coups in Asian, African and Latin American countries, mostly performed by small groups of conspirators.

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 26, p. 448.

² See *Communist Viewpoint*, Toronto, September-October 1972, No. 5, p. 4.

Also important for the peoples in capitalist and developing countries is the experience of rallying all the viable forces of the nation, at least its majority, round the working class. Revolutionaries abroad study the experience of Lenin's Party in combining socialist and democratic tasks on the eve and in the early months of the October Revolution, and generally the tactics of proletarian parties of all countries in relation to different petty-bourgeois parties.

In the matter of forming the political army of the revolution, especially in the national outlands, Lenin regarded the relationship of the proletariat to the non-proletarian labouring masses as the most important question. It is therefore outright bourgeois slander against Lenin and the Bolshevik party, and a distortion of the history of the October Revolution to say that they ruled out any chance of cooperation with other parties. In fact, cooperation was not ruled out either in theory or in practice. It will be recalled that for a certain period Left Socialist-Revolutionaries were in the central Soviet government along with the Bolsheviks, and that elsewhere in the country, chiefly in the national areas, the Bolsheviks' cooperation with petty-bourgeois parties was still more extensive. If this cooperation ended, it was not due to any "intolerance" of the Bolsheviks, as bourgeois propaganda would have us believe. The reason was that the petty-bourgeois parties did not faithfully serve the interests of the working people, and fell in with the plans of foreign and domestic counter-revolution. The retribution was political isolation from the masses and, as a result, political oblivion.

So when enemies of socialism now talk of the necessity of a "free play of political forces" and brandish slogans of "general national unity", we can only remind them that it has all already happened in the history of the Soviet Union. Moreover, the slogan of "general national unity" was often advanced under the communist flag. But this did not alter its anti-socialist orientation and nationalist essence. Overcoming the resistance of those who continued to interpret the national question in a bourgeois spirit after the socialist revolution, the Communist Party under Lenin's leadership succeeded in eliminating nationalist deviations among part of the population on the periphery, and rallied all the progressive forces of the peoples

for social and national renewal. The working class was the main force that performed this task.

Predicting that some peoples might shorten their historical development by bypassing capitalism, Engels once said that if backward peoples saw from the example of the developed countries how to make the publicly-owned productive forces serve all society, they could follow a shorter road.

The experience of the non-capitalist way of development of the formerly backward people of the Soviet Union and the people of the Mongolian People's Republic is of immense significance for resolving the national question in many of the Asian and African states. Nowadays, experience in non-capitalist development is also available in other countries, and is being closely studied by many peoples of the developing countries seeking to bypass the capitalist stage. Clearly, this will help mitigate the birthpains of the new society in former colonies and dependent countries and accelerate the passage from the pre-capitalist system to socialism. Here, the guarantee of success reposes in the Leninist propositions concerning the forms and methods of non-capitalist development postulated by Lenin and enriched by the experience of a number of the Soviet peoples and the people of the Mongolian People's Republic.

The peoples throwing off the colonial yoke are intently studying the Soviet experience of establishing national statehood, Soviet forms and methods of drawing the masses into government, the use of the state as an instrument of social and national emancipation. Under Soviet power, the peoples of nine out of the fifteen republics of the USSR and 38 other nation-state formations in the Soviet Union, acquired national statehood for the first time in their history. That is just the statistical result. Despite the new conditions in which sovereign national states are emerging, national statehood has retained all its significance for the full liberation and development of once oppressed and backward peoples.

One of the main conclusions to be drawn from the Soviet experience is that the national is always closely interwoven with the international in the development of national statehood. Performed under the banner of internationalism, the October Revolution not only assured national statehood for the stock

population of various regions, but, much more, also the participation of working people of all other nationalities in the building of this national statehood. The policy of the working class and the Communist Party was genuinely internationalist. They drew working people of all nationalities into building the new life, into state administration, no matter what nation or nationality had given its name to this or that republic. The national statehood of the smaller peoples of the Soviet country was built with extensive internationalist aid from the Russian and other larger nations in laying the economic and political foundations of statehood, securing sovereignty, training personnel, developing culture, and so forth. Especially, this applies to peoples which embarked on the socialist road, bypassing capitalism. The important point here is that the change in the correlation of the national and international in the latter's favour increased rather than decreased the involvement of the people of the indigenous nationality in the building of their Soviet national statehood. Moreover, the selfless internationalist assistance of the more advanced nations to the working people of the backward nationalities was one of the main factors behind the latter's truly massive involvement.

The problem of drawing broad popular masses in colonies and dependent countries into the movement for national and social liberation, into building national statehood, did not arise until the imperialist colonial system began to fall apart. The role of the world socialist system in assuring the disintegration of colonialism was very great indeed. "The forces of world socialism," said the Statement of the 1960 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, "contributed decisively to the struggle of the colonial and dependent peoples for liberation from imperialist oppression. The socialist system has become a reliable shield for the independent national development of the peoples who have won freedom."¹ Assistance to the oppressed peoples in demolishing imperialism's colonial system gave added momentum to the world revolution, accelerating the rate of national and international processes not only in the zone of national liberation, but also in the former metropolitan countries. This was due to the fact that

¹ *The Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism*, Moscow, 1963, p. 62.

after the termination of colonial oppression, many of the national aspects in its own country took on a different complexion for the working class of the former oppressor nation: differentiation between the proletariat and bourgeoisie within the nation, relations with other (including the formerly oppressed) peoples, and the like.

The continuous assistance of the socialist countries to the liberation struggle of working people across the world also contributes substantially to the acceleration of the world revolutionary process. Especially extensive and versatile aid comes from the Soviet Union.

At present, the Soviet Union aids peoples fighting against imperialism while its own economic, political and military potential is growing and it is no longer alone, acting on the world scene in common with other socialist countries. But there was a time when the Soviet people aided other peoples in restoring national statehood and laying the foundations of socialism in incomparably more complicated conditions. Take the time at the end and immediately after the Great Patriotic War. The Soviet Union had not yet recovered from the losses inflicted by nazi Germany, when, doing its international duty, it rendered the maximum assistance to the peoples of Eastern Europe and Southeast Asia in laying the foundations of socialism. It would have been very difficult for some of the countries to get back on their feet without Soviet aid. Suffice it to recall that Poland, for instance, had lost nearly 40 per cent of her national riches and 22 per cent of her population during the nazi occupation.

Yet, battling tremendous difficulties at home, the Soviet Union faithfully performed its international duty willed by the founders of scientific communism, by the great Lenin. "We Communists are building up socialism and communism in our respective countries, and we regard this as our paramount duty," said Leonid Brezhnev. "But at the same time, by the essence of our convictions, by our education, by the command of our hearts, we internationalists cannot be and never can be indifferent to the destinies of socialist construction in other countries, the common cause of socialism and communism on earth."¹

¹ *Moscow News*, No. 28, 1968, Supplement, p. 6-7.

Out of the 1,894 industrial and other projects built abroad by the Soviet Union by the beginning of 1975, the vast majority (1,416) were built in socialist countries. On the other hand, once the world socialist system had taken shape, its assistance to other streams of the world revolutionary process increased greatly, although, naturally, the main burden of aiding other peoples was and still is borne by the Soviet Union. Invariably, this aid has a very strong bearing not only on the revolutionary movement in general, but also on the solution of the national question. This applies to the socialist countries and, especially, to the national liberation movement.

The Soviet Union played a decisive part in the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples during the Second World War. Later, together with the other socialist countries, with the working class of the developed capitalist countries, it rendered all-round assistance to the national liberation movement. In the 1950s, the most memorable Soviet actions in support of peoples fighting against colonialism include the firm Soviet demands to end the imperialist aggression against Egypt, Syria and Iraq. It will be recalled that after the Soviet action the imperialists were compelled to back down, and abandoned their aggressive plans.

The volume, forms and methods of Soviet aid to the national liberation movement depend mostly on the stage of that movement. When the oppressed peoples were still fighting for political independence, the Soviet Union gave them mainly moral and political support, and if necessary also supplied arms. The main form of aid to the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America in the next stage of their liberation struggle—the period of securing economic independence—is aid in industrialisation, agricultural development, training of personnel, and the like.

The national liberation revolutions in Asia and Africa, and the socialist revolution in Cuba, had the Soviet Union's full support, and in some cases Soviet assistance included military aid, especially arms. It was notably thanks to Soviet aid that the peoples of Algeria, Indonesia, Yemen and a few other countries won their freedom and independence. The all-round Soviet assistance and military protection played a very substantial part in assuring the freedom and independence of the heroic

Cuban people. The working people of Vietnam, too, were able to resist US aggression successfully chiefly because the might of the Soviet Union and the socialist world was on their side.

Now, too, mindful of Lenin's behests, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the entire Soviet people are performing their main international task with commendable success, doing the maximum that can be done in one country *for the development, support and awakening of the revolution in all countries*. But never by "exporting" revolution. Adventurism—attempts to make the revolution for those who must make it themselves—is totally alien to the Soviet people. Rendering all the aid they can to a people fighting for their freedom and national independence, or defending their gains and building a new life—that is a different matter.

Lenin said that giving such assistance is essential for the socialist countries themselves, as well as the oppressed peoples fighting for emancipation. Anticipating the present stage of close unity, he wrote in 1916: "We shall exert every effort to foster association and merger with the Mongolians, Persians, Indians, Egyptians. We believe it is our duty and *in our interest* to do this, for otherwise socialism in Europe will *not be secure*."¹ The Soviet people, the people of other socialist countries, treat Lenin's behest as sacred. The Programme of the Soviet Communist Party says: "The CPSU considers fraternal alliance with the peoples who have thrown off colonial or semi-colonial yoke to be a corner-stone of its international policy. This alliance is based on the common vital interests of world socialism and the world national-liberation movement."² The CPSU Central Committee stressed in its resolution: "With the young national states our country has established relations founded on equality, mutual respect, non-interference in internal affairs, and on comprehensive cooperation in the general anti-imperialist struggle. The Soviet Union consistently supports the revolutionary movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America for economic liberation from imperialism, and for social progress. The USSR implements the policy of international solidarity with the patriots who are

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 67.

² *Road to Communism*, p. 497.

carrying on the armed fight against the still existing colonial and racist regimes.”¹

Especially valuable for the newly-free peoples is Soviet aid in building their independent national economy. Such aid was rendered throughout the postwar period. In 1966-1970 it totalled more than five billion rubles, chiefly in terms of equipment.

The magnitude of Soviet aid to countries that opted for socialism following their liberation from colonialism, may be measured by the fact that 256 enterprises, facilities and other projects were built in the People's Republic of China, 167 in the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and 46 in the Korean People's Democratic Republic.

Over 30 per cent of all the Soviet economic and technical commitments were to developing countries. At present economic and technical aid is rendered to almost 50 national states in Asia, Africa and Latin America. By the beginning of 1975 the Soviet Union was committed to aiding the construction or reconstruction of 899 industrial enterprises and other projects. Among these are such modern industrial giants as the two iron and steel mills in India (Bhilai and Bokaro) and one in Egypt (Hulwan), and the giant dams on the Nile (Egypt) and the Euphrates (Syria). 472 of these projects have already been put into operation. The enterprises built with Soviet aid will produce 16 million tons of steel yearly, 12.3 million tons of rolled stock, 10.5 million tons of coal, 6.8 million tons of iron ore, 11.6 million tons of oil, etc.

The Soviet Union is also helping many of the developing nations in training personnel. It is helping in the construction of more than 140 educational establishments, out of which 94 are already operating. This enables the liberated peoples to train hundreds of thousands of highly skilled personnel at home. Besides, many young people are sent for training to the Soviet Union.

Over 19,000 students from Asia, Africa and Latin America have graduated from Soviet higher and secondary special educational establishments and some 35,000 are getting their

¹ *On Preparations for the 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*. Resolution of the CC CPSU, p. 22.

education in Lumumba Friendship University and other educational establishments. In addition, tens of thousands of specialists from the developing countries received Soviet technical training in specific fields of production. Twice as many Soviet specialists were sent to other countries to render technical, scientific and other assistance. While there, the Soviet specialists trained several hundred thousand skilled workers and technicians through a system of training courses.

The other countries of the world socialist system, too, are aiding the developing nations.

By the beginning of 1975, the member-countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) were assisting 64 countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America in building over 3,000 industrial enterprises and other projects. Among them: some 650 power stations of various capacities and other power-generating and power-distributing projects; 180 machine-building and metal-working projects; over 50 enterprises of the iron and steel and non-ferrous industries; and more than 500 projects of the light, textile and food industries. Tens of thousands of people from over 100 developing countries and colonial territories have received or are receiving training in the CMEA countries.

The ties of the newly-independent countries with the market of the world socialist system are expanding continuously, which is of special significance for ensuring their economic independence. Between 1965 and 1972, their trade with the CMEA member-countries increased 500 per cent; it exceeded 10 billion rubles in 1974. As early as 1965 socialist countries abolished customs duties on imports from developing nations. Long-term trade agreements and contracts provide the developing countries with a stable and growing outlet for their goods in the socialist world, and also enable them to save valuable foreign currency on imports. The socialist countries are a dependable source of precisely those commodities which assure the progress and economic independence of the Asian and African peoples: the socialist world's exports there consist almost 50 per cent of machines and equipment.

This is how the peoples of the world socialist system put into practice Lenin's idea that the main thing is to work not only for political independence, for in view of imperialist domination

this is frequently purely formal, but also for economic liberation. Exposing bourgeois ideologues, Lenin stressed that they talk "of *national* liberation ... leaving out *economic* liberation. Yet in reality it is the latter that is the chief thing".¹

Apart from its immediate benefits for the national economies of developing countries, and apart from helping train national personnel, the aid of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries yields considerable indirect effects. Afraid to lose their influence among the peoples of the former colonial empires, the imperialist powers are forced to compete in rendering economic aid to the liberated peoples.

The "aid" from the imperialist countries is always tied to various economic and political conditions, and is aimed largely at supporting reactionary regimes, at building up the latter's armed forces to suppress the national liberation movement, at assuring conditions for stepped up exploitation and plunder of the natural wealth of liberated peoples.

Not all the aid coming from the Soviet Union, the world socialist system and the working class of developed capitalist countries can be expressed in figures. The transfer of experience in building socialism and communism, the clear display of the advantages of socialism, the impact of the Marxist-Leninist ideology, and political actions in foreign affairs — all this is of inestimable value. Lenin said that the very existence of the Soviet country, its economic successes, "are a gigantic force and a factor of revolution".² In present conditions, with the steady consolidation of the world socialist system, this force has grown immensely.

The big part played by the Soviet Union in the liberation struggle of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples, the significance of its aid, was stressed by representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties at the 1969 International Meeting. Luis Corvalán (Chile) said in his speech that the Soviet Union is the outpost of the struggle of the peoples for progress, that it plays the decisive role in 20th-century history; Khalid Bagdash (Syria) noted the extremely varied aid of the Soviet Union to revolutionary movements throughout the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 398.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 42, p. 241.

world. "All the Arab peoples, and especially those of Syria and Egypt," he said, "know from their own experience the tremendous magnitude of this Soviet aid, which helps us defend our independence, freedom and the progressive national regime against imperialist and Zionist aggression."¹

The 24th and 25th Congresses of the CPSU provided conclusive evidence of the growing international influence of the Soviet Union and other socialist states. The Congress documents contained an exhaustive and profound analysis of the place and role of the world socialist system in human progress at the present stage, and outlined the ways of extending this role with the unfolding of the world revolutionary process. Leaders of Marxist-Leninist parties of socialist countries attending the Congresses reaffirmed their fidelity to proletarian internationalism, and representatives of all the other parties stressed in their messages the immense significance of the international duty performed by the socialist countries in the worldwide struggle for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.

"The main basis of our close co-operation, its soul and the guiding, organising force," said L. I. Brezhnev in the Central Committee's Report to the 25th CPSU Congress, "is the indissoluble militant alliance of the *Communist parties of socialist countries*, the identity of their world outlook, their aims and will. The Central Committee, its Political Bureau, we can say with assurance, have all these years devoted unflagging attention to strengthening our fraternal friendship with these parties. And we can say with deep gratification that the fraternal parties have done likewise."²

Speaking at the Congress, representatives of Marxist-Leninist, national-democratic and socialist parties referred to the historical mission of the Soviet Communist Party, which has blazed the trail to socialism and communism for the peoples, and stressed the role of the Soviet Union in the struggle for world peace. In his Concluding Remarks at the

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 569.

² *Report of the CPSU Central Committee and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy*, p. 10.

Congress, L. I. Brezhnev said: "We are grateful for these expressions and, for our part, assure the Communists, workers and all fighters for national and social freedom in all countries that the Communists and all the people of the Soviet Union will continue to be equal to their internationalist tasks in the future as well!"¹

Addressing the Congress, Edward Giereck, First Secretary of the Polish United Workers' Party, declared full support for the policy of cementing the ideological unity of the socialist forces, and for joint action with other democratic movements and fighters for social progress across the world. "We look upon the national democratic movement with feelings of solidarity," he said, "and rejoice over its victories. We support the developing countries in their bid for complete independence."

"Along with the other socialist countries," said Janos Kadar, First Secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, the Hungarian People's Republic, "our Party and our people are working for a more solid peace, for the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems, and for closer fruitful contacts between them. At the same time, we are in full solidarity with the progressive democratic forces fighting the dictatorship of monopoly, and also with the peoples fighting for political and economic independence."

Speaking at the Congress, representatives of the peoples of all continents commended the role of the world socialist system, and stressed the significance of the international duty of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people.

"We are sincerely and profoundly grateful to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the USSR Government and the Soviet people, our dear Soviet brothers, for the support and aid they are rendering the people of Vietnam; we know it comes from their hearts," said Le Duan, First Secretary of the Vietnam Party of Labour in his message to the 25th CPSU Congress. Kaysone Phomvihane, General Secretary of the People's Revolutionary Party of Laos, described the victory of the national-democratic revolution in his country as a material-

¹ *Report of the CPSU Central Committee and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy*, p. 11.

isation of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, the friendship and the close military cooperation of the fraternal peoples of Laos, Vietnam and Cambodia. He stressed, too, that it was also a victory "for the international solidarity of the world's revolutionary forces—those three ever turbulent streams in the world, of which the main one is the socialist system." Fidel Castro, First Secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba, said: "If there had been no Soviet Union, the capitalist powers ... would again without hesitation begin dividing the world. If there had been no Soviet Union, the measure of independence now enjoyed by the smaller states would have been inconceivable, and neither would the successful struggle of the peoples for regaining control over their natural wealth, and the fact that their voice is heard so impressively in the concert of nations." The First Secretary of the Iraqi Communist Party, Aziz Mohammed, stressed that "the successes of the revolutionary forces in even the most remote corners of the globe cannot be viewed in isolation from the growing influence and effective support of the Soviet Union." Francisco Mendez, representing the African Party for Independence in Guinea and the Cape Verde Islands, said: "Throughout the long years of the arduous war against Portuguese colonial rule we were aware of the lofty internationalist sentiment of the Soviet people." And Alves Batista, representative of the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola, concurred. "The way to our victory over Portuguese colonialism," he said, "was paved with the aid of the Soviet Union. For this reason, permit me from this high rostrum again to express our gratitude, respect and thanks to the CPSU, the Soviet people, and all the Socialist countries."

Representatives of the revolutionary forces who came to the Congress expressed their appreciation of the international impact of Soviet economic achievements, which they rightly described as the base of the world revolutionary process.

The above passages show the immense influence of the Soviet Union, of the entire world socialist system, both as regards the social processes in the international working-class and national liberation movements and the national and international processes in the life of the peoples. To begin with, the assistance of the socialist countries is aimed at laying

the economic foundation for the freedom and national independence gained by the peoples. Second, it substantially accelerates the emergence of a national working class and national intelligentsia, and national development in general. The consolidation of young national states is speeded, they establish closer economic, political and cultural ties with the socialist countries. Third, the formation of nations and nationalities occurs more rapidly under the influence of ties with the socialist countries.

The new type of state relations based on equality, national sovereignty, territorial integrity, mutual assistance and non-interference in each other's internal affairs, shaped by the world socialist system, is an instructive example for the international working-class and national liberation movement. The peoples of Asia and Africa, especially those on the non-capitalist way, are already trying to implement some of the elements of inter-state relations practised by the socialist countries.

It was on the initiative of the socialist states, staunchly supported by the developing countries, that the United Nations repeatedly discussed the final elimination of the remnants of colonialism and the independent development of the oppressed peoples. Frustrating imperialist intrigues, the relevant UN resolutions proclaimed the right of the peoples to free national development and the formation of national states.

Another important factor for the development of the world revolutionary process is the role of the socialist countries in safeguarding world peace and security. The military potential of the Soviet Union and other socialist states is a dependable guarantee of the free development of all peoples, big and small.

For more than half a century, the progressive forces of the non-socialist world recognise that socialism influences the solution of the problem of nations and national relations in the life of all mankind mainly through its deep humanism towards big and small peoples and their mutual relations, and its universally recognised internationalism. The peoples of the world see the internationalism of socialist humanism in the active struggle fought against all forms of national oppression,

for genuine freedom of development, for the elimination of wars and for peaceful relations, rendering selfless aid to all peoples fighting for freedom and national independence, and for a cardinal solution of the age-old problems of national relations.

Nothing imperialism can do will halt or even retard the growth of the might and power of the socialist world. Its all-embracing and multiple influence on the various aspects of the development of the peoples and their relations in the non-capitalist world at present may be measured by what statesmen and political leaders of different countries said about the role of the USSR on its 50th anniversary.

"The 50 years of socialist construction in the USSR is the beacon of hope for the world's alienated, the frustrated, the countless millions 'yearning to be free'," said Gus Hall, General Secretary of the CP USA in his message of greeting to the joint sitting of the CC CPSU, the USSR Supreme Soviet and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet on the 50th anniversary of the Soviet Union. "It is the source of confidence for the fighters against capitalist exploitation. It is the inspiration to the millions on all continents fighting for national liberation. It opens up the path to the victims of racist oppression. The 50th anniversary of the Soviet state sends out the message: human society does have an ever-brighter future."¹

Rodney Arismendi, First Secretary of the CC CP Uruguay, said in his message that building the great internationalist power — fortunately for all fighters against imperialism, for all peoples of the world — ranks among the greatest achievements of those who conquered in the October Revolution.

Pierre Gensous, General Secretary of the World Federation of Trade Unions, said that the working class, which is internationalist by nature, the trade unions, all people fighting for progress in all countries, celebrated the 50th anniversary of the Soviet Union as their own holiday. Gopal Swarup Pathak, Vice-President of the Republic of India, described the formation of the USSR as a voluntary union of equal nations and the destruction of racial and linguistic barriers, as an outstanding event in the history of mankind. Benjedid Chadli,

¹ *Daily World*, December 23, 1972.

member of the Revolutionary Council of the Algerian People's Democratic Republic, noted that the successes of other peoples, the successes of the national liberation movement and of all anti-imperialist forces, were closely linked with the successes of the peoples of the Soviet Union. He said that the victories of the Soviet Union were a stirring example for the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America fighting against colonialism, neocolonialism and imperialism, and for national independence, progress and peace.

Noting the universal recognition by the world's progressive forces of the role and significance of the Soviet Union for the future of all mankind, the CC CPSU said in its Resolution: "*The USSR, in world affairs, is a force firmly and consistently adhering to the policy of peace and friendship, upholding the Leninist principles of the equality of peoples, resolutely opposing colonialism, neocolonialism and racialism, and all forms of national oppression.* This policy has always been a major factor in counteracting the aggressive strategy of imperialism and reaction, and an instrument of active struggle against wars of conquest. It has always worked for the security and freedom of peoples, and for social progress."¹

Inspired by the ideology of proletarian internationalism, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the other countries of the world socialist system exercise a strong influence on the various aspects of the national question in the developed capitalist, and also the developing countries, helping to accelerate the world revolutionary process.

¹ *On Preparations for the 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.* Resolution of the CC CPSU, p. 12.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT AND THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN THE DEVELOPED CAPITALIST COUNTRIES

1. THE WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT AND THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS

The international working-class movement is becoming an increasingly powerful, well organised and politically active force in the capitalist world. This is evidenced by the influence of the working class on the development of nations and national relations in capitalist countries.

The influence of the international working-class movement on resolving the national question in the world revolutionary process is closely linked with the influence of the world socialist system. First, in the working-class movement international processes supercede national ones; internationalism is one of its motive forces. Second, national factors in the life and class struggle of the individual contingents of the movement are closely considered, for they are important for unity in the struggle against capitalist oppression. Third, along with the world socialist system, the international working-class movement is firmly opposed to national oppression in any form, and stands for the equality of all peoples, big and small. The international working class and world socialism make a palpable contribution to the liberation of the peoples, because they determine the new world alignment of class forces and help in various ways to promote proletarian internationalism in the national liberation and democratic movements, help the oppressed peoples politically and materially, and assist the working class in every country to perform its leading role in relation to other classes and strata.

The facts have confirmed the Leninist tenet that the content of our epoch is determined by the international working class—the influence of the world socialist system and the struggle of the workers in capitalist countries for peace, democracy and socialism. The political battles undermining

the capitalist world confirm the fact that the working class determines the essence of our epoch, for, among other things, the number of strikers has risen from 74 million in the 20 prewar years of 1919-1939 to 272 million in 1969 to 1974. And here the most salient point is that two out of every three strikers were involved in political strikes.

The international working class exercises the influence of the world revolutionary process through the Marxist-Leninist ideology, of which proletarian internationalism is a part. One of the forms of this influence is active participation in the general democratic movement. And among the causes for which this movement battles the national question occupies one of the leading places. Present-day imperialism has sharpened the contradictions of capitalist society, including those of national relations, to the extreme. Hardly any sphere of society has escaped the effects of this: the danger of nuclear war threatens the very existence of countries and peoples with ancient cultures and impressive contributions to world civilisation; social progress is being held up by such phenomena of present-day capitalism as racism and chauvinism, racial segregation and apartheid, nationalism and cosmopolitanism; fascism and its man-hating ideology still survives in many countries, new forms of it appear, undermining the very foundation on which nations and nationalities exist. The bourgeoisie is doing all it can to curb the struggle of the proletariat by corrupting it with nationalist ideology and turning the national question into a tangle of contradictions between countries and peoples. The contradictions are portrayed as eternal and ungovernable. The purpose: to prevent the collapse of bourgeois power and hold up, if not avert, the world's further passage from capitalism to socialism.

Since in many countries the national question has turned out to be one of the most important social problems, the struggle of the working class for solving it can mobilise the masses in defence of the democratic gains of working people and unite all the sound forces of the nation in a mighty anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly front for radical socio-economic solutions and subsequent advance to socialism.

The working class and its Marxist-Leninist parties seek to

determine the correlation of the national and international. In criticising the Marxist-Leninist teaching on nations and national relations, bourgeois propaganda usually opposes these two concepts. In reality, however, the national and international are unbreakably linked.

The international working class is the leading and most active force behind the internationalisation of the life of society. Comprising nearly 600 million, it produces three-quarters of the world's social product, and by this alone in many ways determines the social progress of the peoples. It is profoundly internationalist by nature, and the tendency towards unity is its very lifeblood. Moreover, the advanced workers have a genuinely internationalist ideology: Marxism-Leninism.

Take the working class of France. It has shown examples of true internationalism. Brought up on the heroic traditions of the Paris Communards, it fought its own imperialists tirelessly when they trampled the freedom of the peoples in colonies and dependent countries. The peoples of Vietnam, Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco and other former French colonies will never forget the aid they invariably received from the French workers in their battle for national liberation and statehood. Many British workers took action against the British imperialists' colonial war in Malaya. The workers and progressive forces in Portugal firmly supported the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and the Cape Verde Islands in their struggle for independence and their fight against Portuguese colonialists. Speaking at the 25th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, Alvaro Cunhal, General Secretary of the Portuguese Communist Party, said: "In our struggle we are inspired and impelled not only by our faith in the working class and the people, but also by the internationalist solidarity of the democratic and progressive forces, the national liberation movement, and the fraternal solidarity of the Marxist-Leninist parties with which we are joined in our great international family of Communists. The unity of this family on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism is essential if we want to achieve common victory."

The resistance of the people in the metropolitan countries to colonial oppression abroad has always been no less dangerous

for the imperialists than the liberation struggle of the enslaved peoples. This is why monopoly capital is exerting itself to corrupt the minds of workers in metropolitan countries. "Only the proletarian class, which maintains the whole of society," Lenin said, "can bring about the social revolution."¹ But as a result of imperialist colonial policy, society is maintained not only by the labour of the working class of the metropolitan countries, but largely also by that of imperialist-oppressed peoples of colonies and dependent countries. This creates economic grounds for the contagion of colonial chauvinism to spread to part of the proletariat, which opens the door to opportunism in the working-class movement.

The present state of the working-class movement in Britain and the United States confirms Lenin's thesis that the imperialist policy of oppressing other peoples tends to corrupt the minds of the workers. This is why the racist ideology is so tenacious, and why the bourgeoisie in highly developed countries is still able to practise segregation. It is supported by the politically backward part of the workers.

Monopoly capital wants to reduce to the minimum the internationalist influence of the proletariat, for it furthers the internationalisation of society. The financial magnates distort the purpose of cooperation among peoples, which is an objective need of social production. To break off the shaping international ties between the peoples of capitalist and socialist countries, a number of capitalist states had at one time cut off economic relations with the socialist states and reduced cultural contacts to a bare minimum.

Now, the failure of the policy of world imperialism is obvious to everyone. The economic, political and military might of the socialist countries, on the one hand, and the protests of the masses in capitalist countries, coupled with the system's inability to reverse the deepening general crisis of capitalism, on the other, have compelled the more realistic politicians of the capitalist world to revise their foreign-policy line. Those are the main reasons why imperialism is now forced to retreat and gravitates towards broader cooperation with the socialist world.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, p. 77.

Monopoly capital also tries to promote its ends through multiple ties between capitalist countries. This is best seen from the policy of US monopolies. During the postwar period their chase after profit through export of capital was always accompanied by far-reaching political aims. Plundered by the nazis and ravaged by the war, Western Europe fell under the influence of US capital through the medium of the Marshall Plan. US pressure resulted in the removal of Communists from government and in a strengthening of reaction on the political scene in general. Reactionary efforts to consolidate capitalism in the West-European countries were backed up by the establishment of the aggressive NATO bloc, broad plans for "Europe's political integration" and an all-European "supra-national government".

Typically, this was and still is being done under the flag of integration and cosmopolitanism. Take the European Coal and Steel Community, a super-cartel, and the Common Market with its free transfusions of capital and manpower, abolition of customs barriers and strident propaganda that peoples should give up the "outdated" concepts of national sovereignty and independence. The multinational Austro-Hungarian monarchy is extolled in bourgeois history and political books as a model "solution" of the national question. It is declared a suitable model for present-day Western Europe, the peoples of which are enjoined gradually to give up their national statehood in favour of an all-European government.

However, what the monopolies really wanted was to put up an "iron curtain" between East and West—something that Joachim von Ribbentrop had dreamed up but had not accomplished. This was not all. They also wanted to disrupt the progressive process of internationalisation.

How world imperialism distorts the true progressive essence of internationalisation may be seen from many other examples in bourgeois society and in the developing countries. The variety of military blocs and "federations" of different states, coupled with other refined methods, are camouflage for imperialist subversion, for attempts to block the peoples' growing unity.

Imperialism has in part succeeded in exploiting the objective processes of internationalisation to buttress its positions in the

struggle against world socialism and the labouring masses. Basically, however, the process is incontestably progressive and unconquerable. The scientific and technological revolution, for example, has crossed national frontiers. And unity is the keynote in the peoples' fight to prevent nuclear war and imperialist aggression, and to strengthen friendship and cooperation with socialist countries.

The peoples of Europe are strongly resisting the plans of abolishing national sovereignty and independence, and creating a supranational government in Europe.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries succeeded in preventing feelings of national hostility and hatred, for which there were ample grounds during the war against German fascism and its satellites. This fact has a strong bearing on the positive internationalisation processes in Europe. Motivated by their sense of class unity and proletarian internationalism, they overcame the spontaneous sense of national hostility, and drew a dividing line between the German people and German fascism.

Modern bourgeois propaganda maintains that there is a "dynamic need for war at the root of all outward collisions of national interests", ostensibly planted by nature in the national consciousness of the peoples. Countering this cannibal "theory", socialism presents a model of how to align national relations with the objective process of internationalisation and the subjective process of internationalist education. The most advanced workers of different countries know that it had been socialism which assured friendly relations of cooperation and mutual assistance between the German Democratic Republic and other socialist countries, though the memory of the bloody crimes of the German nazis was still fresh.

True to proletarian internationalism, the peoples of the socialist countries have friendly feelings for the working people of the Federal Republic of Germany, knowing that the efforts of the extreme reactionary elements to revive nazism there have nothing in common with the people's interests. Quite the reverse. These interests are served by the world socialist system's persevering efforts to curb the West German revenge-seekers.

In the present-day capitalist world processes of inter-

nationalisation are generated, first and foremost, by economic needs. Production in the industrially developed countries and also in Asia, Africa and Latin America, is *social*. This impels the need for a continuous expansion of the social division of labour and for links between national economic complexes. Furthermore, there are the social consequences of the scientific and technological revolution, which necessitates specialisation and cooperation in production, as well as cooperation in science, technology, and so forth.

The processes of internationalisation also encompass a new factor, which appeared after the Second World War: the growing unity of the peoples, the labouring masses, as a counterweight to imperialism's prewar omnipotence in relations between nations. It reposes on the successful struggle against neocolonialism, for the final elimination of colonialism, for a more solid peace won at such a high price, and for the banning of thermonuclear weapons. Not only the labouring masses led by the working class and its Marxist-Leninist parties, but also a considerable section of the middle and small bourgeoisie, are rising against the rule of monopoly capital. Admittedly, the variety of class and other motivations of the participants in the anti-imperialist struggle affects its scale and character. But its role in spurring the processes of internationalisation is exceedingly great: it weakens the foundations of imperialism, and strengthens the positions of the peace forces and the forces of democracy and socialism.

Growth of internationalist proletarian unity hinges on the class solidarity of the workers in the struggle against the bourgeoisie. But successful growth depends in large measure on how fully the national processes in the life of the peoples are taken into account. The multiplicity of these processes and their causes, and the much more contradictory nature of their development in the postwar period, have introduced a number of salient factors into the content of the national question in present-day bourgeois society.

One of these is the tendency towards forming national states or improving their forms, depending on the tasks facing the people in question. And in the postwar period, too, this tendency was strongly influenced by the experience of national and state development in the USSR. Also prominent was direct

assistance: the crushing defeat of German fascism and Japanese imperialism by the Soviet Army with the support of all freedom-loving peoples enabled many of them to regain their national statehood.

After the Second World War, the will of the peoples to form national states was backed by the right of nations to self-determination formalised in the United Nations Charter. This the peoples owe to the progressive forces of the world, above all the Soviet Union. But the right to self-determination is continuously violated by the monopolies, which persist in attempts to settle the fate of the peoples in their own way.

Bourgeois propaganda puts the blame for the division of the German, Korean and Vietnamese peoples on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. But the real culprits are the imperialists. While the Second World War was still on, they nursed plans of depriving certain peoples, first of all the Germans, the Balkan peoples, and others — of their national statehood.¹

US and British attempts to force these issues in Teheran and Yalta yielded no results. And the Potsdam decisions on denazification, democratisation and demilitarisation were, on Soviet insistence, based on the concept of Germany's territorial integrity. The national statehood of the Austrian and Balkan peoples, too, was guaranteed. It was by *faits accomplis* that the imperialists later divided Germany by creating Bizonia and then Trizonia, on the basis of which the West German monopolies set up the Federal Republic of Germany.

In the resulting circumstances, the working people in the Soviet occupation zone had no choice but to form their own

¹ On December 1, 1943, at the Teheran Conference, Roosevelt and Churchill expounded the idea of dismembering Germany. Roosevelt suggested forming five independent states, and placing the Kiel Canal zone and the Hamburg, Ruhr and Saar areas under United Nations control. Churchill wanted to divide Germany into a still larger number of small states, to separate the southern provinces of Prussia, and, stripping the peoples of the Danube basin of national statehood, to create a Balkan federation. There is documentary evidence that the Soviet Government, represented by J. V. Stalin, strongly opposed this plan. The head of the Soviet government also rejected the idea of a Balkan federation which, as Churchill conceived it, was to have been formed after an Anglo-American landing there as a barrier isolating the Soviet Union from Western Europe.

national state, the German Democratic Republic, where a socialist German nation is now developing.

The German Democratic Republic developed from the outset as the alternative to the anti-national domination of state-monopoly capital and the expansionist imperialist policy of the West German magnates. This is why Lenin's teaching on nations and national relations has special relevance to the strategy and tactics of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SUPG).¹

In its resolution on the report of Erich Honecker, First Secretary of the CC SUPG, the 8th Party Congress said: "There cannot and never will be so-called special inter-German relations between the socialist German Democratic Republic, in which a socialist German nation is developing, and the monopolist FRG, in which the old bourgeois nation exists.

"The Congress declares: a natural process of dissociation is under way between the German Democratic Republic and the FRG—those two states with opposite social systems and independent of each other. For this reason, only relations of peaceful coexistence based on international law can exist between them."²

The case of the German people clearly confirms the Marxist-Leninist postulate that the national question is always socially determined. And the social content depends largely on what class is the leading class, what class directs the nation. While monopoly capital has retained control in the western part of Germany, the working people of the German Democratic Republic are building socialism.

2. SHARPENING OF THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN CAPITALIST COUNTRIES

In the developed capitalist countries national processes have become much sharper. The most typical is the Afro-American question in the United States, the Quebec question in Canada, the Walloon-Flemish in Belgium, and the problems of

¹ See *Kommunist*, 1969, No. 6, p. 34 (in Russian).

² *Dokumente des VIII. Parteitages der Sozialistischen Einheitspartei Deutschlands*, Berlin, 1971, S. 17.

Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland in Britain. The growth of these processes is linked with the specific features of modern imperialism and the continuing formation and development of nations in bourgeois society.

The history of the Afro-American question in the United States is a history of two and a half centuries of Black slavery and over a hundred years of racial discrimination. The Black people have fought for liberation with growing determination throughout this time. The Black question is a class, racial, and national question. The explosions of Black anger in US cities in the summer of 1967 and one more "hot summer" in 1968 showed clearly that the Black movement was not only racial and national, but first and foremost social. However, to be understood it must be approached as one of the most complex national questions of the age.

The 25 million Afro-Americans in the United States comprise about 12 per cent of the population. Before the Second World War and in the early postwar period the majority of them lived in the Black Belt,—the southern states of Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, Louisiana and South Carolina. Here there had been potentialities for the emergence of an Afro-American nation. At one time, the Communist Party advanced the idea of self-determination of the Negro nation in the Black Belt. But savage social and national oppression precluded the shaping of the economic basis for nationhood. National culture and national self-awareness were more developed. But social and national oppression, coupled with frenetic racism and chauvinism, prevented the formation of the Black people into a nation.

Given free and truly democratic development of US society, the Black people need not have been a separate entity and would have gradually blended into the single US nation. Tens of millions of foreigners swiftly and thoroughly became part of the single nation. But the reactionary forces put up an insuperable barrier between the Blacks and the other Americans.

The first 15 postwar years created a new social situation for the Black people. First, in class structure 94 per cent of the adults become urban workers. Second, due to a whole number of reasons stemming from the development of US capitalism

there was an exodus of Blacks from the South to the urban centres of the North — and this continues to this day. Only half of the Black population has remained in the Black Belt. In view of this, the 1959 National Convention of the US Communist Party annulled the slogan for the self-determination of the Black people, because, it said, the Blacks had failed to form into a nation and the prospect for this in the present capitalist conditions was practically nil. However, the Convention put down in its resolution that though the Black people in the United States are not a nation, the Black question continues to be a national question. That it certainly is. What must be determined is what type of national question it is, what distinctive features it has, and what the strategic conception should be for resolving it.

There are different, sometimes diametrically opposite, trends in the Black movement. The main one, however, may be described as internationalist; most militants demand full Black freedom and factual equality.

The other important trend is coloured by "Black nationalism", and is of a separatist complexion. Its exponents, mainly the Black bourgeoisie, want independent development, and isolation of Blacks from Whites. Some conceive independent development as the self-determination of the Black community, others as unilateral *de facto* formation of a government of the "Republic of New Africa" in the Black Belt.

The separatists' extremism is a result of despair, rather than sober analysis. And they remain in the minority. However, the Black Power slogan advanced by the separatists in June 1966 became unexpectedly popular. The vast majority conceived it not as nationalist isolation of Blacks, but as assurance of favourable conditions for the Black people's progress.

Gus Hall, General Secretary of the CP USA, has recently drawn important theoretical conclusions on this score. As he sees it, the development of Afro-Americans has not in any *practical sense* posed the question of the Blacks' own economic structure and functioning as a nation in a separate territorial and political entity. At the same time, there is a growing national self-awareness, as expressed by insistent cultivation of a national culture, moves to identify culturally with the peoples of Africa, and by a new pride in their achievements. The

factors behind the formation of nations, Gus Hall said, include the factor of practical necessity, which determines whether independent national existence is or is not a realistic possibility. The growth of national pride and the sense of national identity, however important they may be, do not by themselves determine whether or not a people is advancing to nationhood.

The historical conditions in which the Blacks develop determined the incontestable fact that the vast Black majority did not respond to the idea of self-determination in the conventional sense of the term, that is, as a nation wishing to create national statehood and have its own government. All the same, though the 19th Convention of the CP USA did point out that the "Black people do not now constitute a nation", it put down in its resolution: "As we adhere to the principle of proletarian internationalism, we do not place any limitations upon the further developments of national struggle of Black people to satisfy their aspirations up to including their right to develop self-government and to exercise the right of self-determination. Moreover, we work to create conditions whereby those rights can be expressed free from all manner of social, economic, political, cultural and legal restrictions."¹ Whites and Blacks, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Indians, and other racial minorities, who, together with the Black people comprise nearly 40 million, must unite in a single anti-monopoly front, which would facilitate the restoration of the democratic freedoms stolen from them by the capitalist class. This would enable Blacks to settle the question in their own way where they are in the majority, and gain equality where they comprise a minority.

The working-class movement is the only basis on which Afro-Americans can succeed in their struggle. This is the central thesis of the CP USA on the Black question. Yet much must be done for participants in the Afro-American movement to understand their objectives and tasks. This applies doubly to the white workers, in whom racism and chauvinism are deep-rooted. The US Communists note with alarm that throughout the 10 years of the powerful uplift of the Black

¹ *Daily World*, 1969, May 15, p. 9.

movement, its support by the white population — protesting racial segregation and other abuses — has declined.

In a book on the liberation struggle of Afro-Americans, writer Claude Lightfoot included a special chapter, "Black Liberation is Impossible Without the Communist Party" where he writes that the Communist Party is a force "that understands the overall nature of capitalist society, the inherent laws that make this society tick, that understands the role of classes," and can therefore "indicate the path ahead".¹

The new Programme of the CP USA stresses that the true interests of all working people, whatever the colour of their skin, lie in the realisation of the closest unity and fraternity. That is at the basis of the strength of the working class and the promise of its deliverance from oppression — economic, national and racial. "For white workers," the Programme says, "race hatred, despising their Black and Brown brothers and joining in discriminating against them, or failing to join the struggle against racism and discrimination, serves only the interests of their own worst enemy — the monopolist exploiters of all workers. By promoting strife and division among the masses, racism weakens their struggles. It prolongs the life of capitalism in this age of its deepening general crisis.

"The fight to root out racism demands a continuous and vastly sharper struggle to demolish every barrier that stands between the Black and Brown people of our country and their full economic, political and social equality and unfettered participation in the life and affairs of the nation."²

Black Americans are triply oppressed: because of race, as workers, and as a people. This is why Black workers must join white workers in the struggle against monopoly capital. "... We reject the notion that Black freedom can be won without white allies," the Programme states. "In industry, Black workers find a common interest with white workers in struggle against capitalist exploitation. Working class unity is essential in the struggle against monopoly domination." Such unity is unthinkable if racism is allowed to remain. "But the fight against

¹ Claude M. Lightfoot, *Ghetto Rebellion to Black Liberation*, New York, 1968, p. 292.

² *New Program of the Communist Party, USA*, N. Y., 1970, p. 61.

racism goes beyond economic questions. It is also a fight for human dignity and for the humanist ideal of the brotherhood of all working people. It is a fight to liberate white Americans from the degrading, corrupting effects of racism on themselves. Class consciousness begins with recognition of the fundamental community interest of Black and white workers.”¹

The idea of unity of all the working people, irrespective of colour, in the struggle against monopoly capital underlies the present-day policy of the US Communist Party. The upholding of this principle by the Communists is linked closely with their uncompromising criticism of various bourgeois and petty-bourgeois separatist, nationalistic concepts. This was a special point of discussion following the report of the National Chairman Henry Winston to the CC CP USA Plenum held in December 1974. The report has exposed both the theoretical and political fallacy of the “internal colony” theory and the “self-determination” slogan as regards the US Black population. The report noted that Blacks shared neither common territory, nor common economy. Henry Winston showed that the strategy for liberating Afro-Americans should ensure Blacks’ full and equal participation in all the spheres of life, including the economy, rather than their alienation from the USA. “The ‘internal colony’ theory”, says the report, “leads away from this strategy. In effect, it tells Black workers to give up the struggle against the monopolists who exploit them at the point of production, and instead to fall in behind those who advocate the fantasy of Black capitalism, or ‘self-determination’ in the ghettos.”²

The 21st Convention of the CP USA, held in July 1975, paid special attention to the struggle for the equality of Blacks and other national minorities, for enhancing their role in the anti-monopoly movement. Particularly important was the exposure of the substance and reactionary role of racism which was characterised by Gus Hall as the main drug for the

¹ *New Program of the Communist Party, USA*, N. Y., 1970, pp. 732-73.

² Henry Winston, “The ‘Internal’ Colony’ Fallacy”, *Political Affairs*, January 1975, p. 20.

divide-and-rule policies of capitalism. In his report, Gus Hall said that the US Communists should continue their efforts to explain that any victory over monopoly capital in the USA requires a broad coalition based on an alliance of the working class and the victims of racial oppression—Afro-Americans, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Asians and native American Indians. They should explain, he noted further, that racial attitudes and Whites' growing indifference towards them are the main obstacle on the road to the class unity and union.

The convention resolved to work for the unity of the labour movement and the oppressed national and racial minorities, to defend the rights of immigrants.

In Great Britain, too, the national question has become sharper. Following the disintegration of British imperialism's colonial empire, England's relationship with Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland (Ulster) deteriorated.

It is many centuries since the English conquered the adjoining territories of the Celtic peoples. Everything was done to root out the national features of the annexed peoples, to incorporate them forcibly into the English nation. But this, as we know, proved in vain.

As a reaction to the social and national oppression of the English bourgeoisie, the peoples of Scotland, Wales and Ireland displayed extraordinary persistence in preserving their national traits, and their struggle for liberty never flagged. The fact that at the acme of Britain's power the propertied strata of the Irish, Scottish and Welsh peoples were allowed to share in the plunder of colonies, did not alter anything. The national question remained as sharp as ever, prompting Frederick Engels to say in 1891 that a federative republic "would be a step forward in Britain where the two islands are peopled by four nations".¹

The first stage of the general crisis of capitalism saw a new sharpening of the national question on the British Isles. There was the Irish insurrection for national independence in 1916, which shook all Great Britain. Guerilla warfare continued for four years. Finally, the British government was compelled to grant dominion status to a larger portion of Ireland. By the

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* (in 3 volumes), Vol. 3, pp. 435-36.

tested colonialist method of "divide and rule", Northern Ireland, the industrial Ulster, was "temporarily" cut off from the rest of the land, depriving it of its national, economic and political integrity. And though Northern Ireland was granted a strongly trimmed autonomy, while Southern Ireland even became a formally independent state after the Second World War, the Irish people have remained a dependent people. They are fighting for their country's reunification as the key to national revival.

Scotland and Wales have gained no autonomy, not even local self-government.

Describing national relations in developed capitalist countries, Lenin wrote shortly before the October Revolution that "even in regard to Britain, where geographical conditions, a common language and the history of many centuries would seem to have 'put an end' to the national question in the various small divisions of the country—even in regard to that country ... the national question was not yet a thing of the past...."¹ Recent events confirm this. National relations in Britain have grown more acute. National resentments, major and minor, have accentuated national consciousness of a new quality in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

This has occurred, first, because of the crisis of British imperialism. The Commonwealth is falling apart, the country is plagued by economic difficulties and contradictions. The inflow of profits, once of fabulous magnitude and the lifeblood of British imperialism, has declined. Second, the new stage of the anti-imperialist struggle across the world and in Britain herself has accentuated the need of elementary democratic rights for the peoples of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Third, the special features of Britain's monopoly capital in the postwar years have caused a sharp economic deterioration in the national areas, growth of unemployment and a general impoverishment of the working people. Fourth, the foundations of the national culture of the Irish, Scottish and Welsh peoples, of their life style and traditions, have begun to erode faster. Loss of national properties and full assimilation have become a real danger. Fifth, in response to demands of

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 447.

elementary civic and national freedoms, the government — first Labour and later Conservative — applied punitive measures to please monopoly capital. Mass protests have grown into a mighty liberation struggle, which in many places involves barricades and bloodshed.

In this new uplift of the liberation struggle the aims of different sections of the bourgeoisie in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland are highly conflicting. Those who still have interests distinct from the interests of the ruling classes in England, are fanning nationalism and advocating separatism. While officially demanding national parliaments, the Scottish and Welsh nationalists also threaten full secession from England. They know, of course, that the model of Denmark, Holland and other small countries, which they assiduously discuss, is hardly practicable because general backwardness and economic dependence on England, and on foreign capital, are insuperable even if they gain political independence. Meanwhile, the sections of the local bourgeoisie whose interests have by now completely blended with those of British monopoly capital, serve the latter faithfully, undermining the efforts of the separatists. In the national areas there are gross official abuses and encouragement of national and religious differences.

The bourgeois programme of solving the national question in Britain is in the nature of a palliative. At best, it is focussed on the constitution of parliaments in Scotland and Wales. But Northern Ireland has had its own parliament for almost half a century, but its national development, like that of the Scottish and Welsh peoples, is still impeded by imperialist oppression. In October 1968 a full-scale civil war broke out in Northern Ireland, first against the abuses of the "national" government and then against the London government's so-called "direct rule from Westminster".

The deployment of British troops in Ulster and the armed struggle there of the past several years, are evidence of British imperialism's growing crisis.

The national question in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland can be solved only by the working class, and this not in a setting of separatist isolation, but in internationalist unity with the whole British proletariat. Nowadays, the working-class

movement in the national regions is even stronger than in the centre. Also, the positions of the Communist Party are more solid there. But its efforts cannot as yet yield effective results. While subjected to national oppression and exploitation by British imperialism, the peoples of Scotland, Ireland and Wales have themselves been allies of the oppressor nation in relation to the peoples of colonies and dependent countries. And this is still having its effect. That is one of the main reasons why a socialist revolution is so slow in coming to all of Britain and, consequently, why the national liberation of the peoples of its internal semicolonies has not yet been accomplished. This fact has not sunk deeply enough into the minds of the working class as a whole, the bulk of which still follows the social-reformists.

The only right way of solving the problems of the working-class movement, including those of the national liberation of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, is that proposed by the Communist Party of Great Britain. As the Communists see it, the reunification and national revival of the Irish nation and freedom for Scotland and Wales will not be achieved until the national movement develops within a general front and becomes one of the streams of the anti-imperialist, general-democratic struggle of the working people of all nationalities and this struggle becomes a transitional stage leading to the country's socialist transformation.

Preserving the internationalist unity of the country's working-class movement and foiling separatist attempts to break it up into national contingents, is the main point of departure in the Communists' programme in the conditions of the bourgeois system. In October 1967, the CP of Great Britain issued a statement concerning the national future of Scotland and Wales. The latest variant of the Party's programme, *The British Road to Socialism*, contains demands for the complete freedom of the peoples of Scotland and Wales in internal affairs and national development. In the case of Northern Ireland the Communists support the wish of the masses to abolish national oppression of the Catholic minority, democratise the state-political structure, and perform socio-economic reforms.

The demand for the complete secession of Scotland and Wales, the Communists hold, is unacceptable. It would undermine the internationalist unity of the working class movement and impede the convergence of peoples inhabiting the British Isles. The constitutional arrangement (a federal plus national parliaments) needs to be changed. There must be a programme for the economic, political and cultural development of the national territories. Whatever turn the national movements may take, Marxists-Leninists stand for the precise combination of national and international processes, with the former subordinate to the latter.

The reasons behind the sharpening of the national question in Belgium resemble those in Britain. The main one is the crisis of Belgian monopoly capital, aggravated by the break-up of the colonial system, which the Belgian monopolies had helped to build. As long as superprofits had streamed in from abroad, the Belgian bourgeoisie constituted one whole and the friction between its national contingents had been insignificant. But when the crisis began in the early 1960s, the Flemish group proved to be more advantageously situated (it was more numerous, the biggest and most modern industries were in Flanders, there was an influx of foreign capital, and so on). Even before the 1960s it had made Flemish the obligatory language and had occupied positions of pre-eminence in the integral Belgian state.

The Walloon branch of the Belgian bourgeoisie held the short end of the stick. The crisis of monopoly capitalism caused a precipitous economic decline of the Walloon community. The state, adapted to its own purposes by the Flemish bourgeoisie, became more and more a foster-parent for the Walloons. It did nothing to end their troubles. And the clash of the interests of the two groups of the Belgian bourgeoisie affected Brussels, which had always been the champion of Belgian unity.

All these circumstances were soon reflected in the linguistic domain and the country's political affairs. The church, various political parties and public organisations became involved in the struggle. National contradictions grew sharper. The political, economic and national consolidation of the Flemish and Walloon communities became more pronounced, and so

did the duality of the situation of Brussels, the country's capital.

The progressive forces, including the Communist Party, attach immense significance to a democratic solution of the national question. Working for national equality, the Communists advocate democratic federalism as the most promising solution, assuring free national development of Flanders and the Walloon areas, and a special status for Brussels. While the Belgian bourgeoisie associates its plans with the activity of the unionists and encourages the Flemish expansionists and French-speaking nationalists, the progressive forces, first of all the Communist Party, rely solely on the working-class movement to assure the country's democratic unity. "It is chiefly the working-class movement that can and must achieve it," says the Resolution of the 19th Congress of the CP of Belgium, "by virtue of its tradition of unity and solidarity developed in a common struggle of more than a hundred years against the Belgian bourgeoisie and its political agents."¹

The struggle of the Flemings and Walloons for free national development is not decisive for the country's present development. It shows, however, that the bourgeoisie is incapable of solving the problem of national relations and administering society.

Unlike the national question in Belgium, which did not become acute until recently, the Quebec question in Canada is a burning issue. The ancestors of the present French-Canadian nation of some six million had been the first to form a colony on Canadian soil more than two centuries ago. Although the British North America Act signed by the English Queen in 1867, assured equal rights to the French and British, the French Canadians suffer the lot of an oppressed minority. Quebec is the seat of the country's richest corporations. The monopolies there make huge profits. Yet wages are lower than in any other Canadian province, and the state of public education and social maintenance, as well as working conditions, are worse than in the rest of the country. The economic oppression of the French-Canadian population is supplemented by national oppression: its aspirations to self-

¹ *Le Drapeau Rouge*, 13, décembre, 1968, p. 8.

determination are being suppressed; due to the linguistic privileges enjoyed by the Anglo-Canadians in Quebec, the French-Canadians are not able to use fully their fundamental rights even in their own province.

To be sure, Quebec has a certain though limited amount of autonomy. But it was gained not through constitutional guarantees, but by virtue of a militant, national unity, and concern for national identity.

The French-Canadians have fought for free national development for many decades. Of late, the struggle has grown still more acute. Gradual accumulation of discontent has developed into a surge of protests against national inequality. But there are other contributing factors. Canada's economic situation has deteriorated sharply. A developed country, it had once benefited considerably from the imperialist colonial system, though it has never possessed colonies of its own. The grip of US monopolies on the Canadian economy has tightened substantially. And the Anglo-Canadian monopoly groups have naturally shifted the main burden of the deteriorating economic situation on the French-Canadian minority.

As in all other developed capitalist countries, the 1960s were highlighted by a powerful upswing of the general-democratic anti-monopoly struggle. The oppressed national minority became involved in it, and this powered an uplift of the national movement. Encouragement also came to some extent from the French monopolies, which are trying to lean on the French-speaking part of the population of Canada to buttress their positions on the American continent.

The French-Canadians are fighting staunchly for economic, political and cultural equality with Anglo-Canadians. In the struggle, the bulk of the population avoids the separatist extremes which came into evidence in the autumn of 1970 with the demands for Quebec's complete secession from Canada. The French-Canadians have too many ties with the rest of the country and want its unity to be preserved. But equal rights and opportunities must be guaranteed to both nations. The country's progressive forces, including the CP of Canada, conceive equality as a confederative arrangement. In January 1968, the Central Committee of the CP of Canada adopted the

following resolution, endorsed by the Party's 20th Congress in April 1969: "A just and democratic solution of the present crisis requires full and unconditional recognition of the right of the French-Canadian people to decide for themselves the course of their national development, the form of their national state and the nature of their relationship with English Canada. This right means that the French-Canadian nation shall be free to choose between separation from Canada and some form of political union with English Canada. Our view is that, of the various options, the most advantageous solution for both peoples would be the working out of a new confederal relationship."¹

The experience of the Soviet Union in granting extensive rights to its constituent republics is highly popular among French-Canadians. The government of Quebec, for example, holds that a French-Canadian state confederatively linked with English Canada, should be represented in international organisations like the Ukraine and Byelorussia are in the United Nations. One French-Canadian petition to Parliament contained the demand that Quebec should have international status comparable to that of the Ukraine and Byelorussia, which would protect it from unacceptable interference by the colonialist government at Ottawa.

Taking guidance in the Marxist-Leninist teaching, the Canadian Communists are showing the masses the real place the national question occupies in the country. The solution should not be confined to just the dispute over language and culture, to which the bourgeoisie tries to divert all the attention, thus obscuring the question of the French-Canadians' national self-determination and especially the class struggle. The country's complex social and economic problems, the Communists point out, cannot be reduced to just the national question. The national question can be solved conclusively if it becomes part of the struggle against monopoly domination, for truly democratic freedoms and for Canada's national independence from US imperialism.

There can be no real sovereignty and independence, the 21st Congress of the Canadian Communists pointed out, until

¹ *The Canadian Tribune*, January 29, 1968.

Quebec's right to national self-determination and sovereignty is acknowledged and formalised in a new Canadian constitution. Those are two aspects of one and the same struggle. This is why the separation of Quebec from the rest of Canada will not satisfy the national demands of the French-Canadians. On the contrary, internationalist unity with Anglo-Canadians and with working people of other nationalities will forge a single general-democratic anti-imperialist front under the leadership of the working class. That is the standpoint of the Canadian Communists. Tim Buck pointed out that "the only path by which genuine self-determination can be achieved is the path of action to unite all democratic forces against the *trusts* and the reactionary circles around them and dependent upon them."¹

Back in the times when the proletariat had only just stepped upon the stage of history and began its struggle for the revolutionary transformation of society, the fate of the national revolutions, as Marx said, "was made subject to the fate of the proletarian revolution, and they were robbed of their apparent autonomy, their independence of the great social revolution."² The facts have confirmed this time and again. In the past, national movements gave scope for the consolidation of capitalism. At present, the fate of the national movements, and still more the success of national processes resulting from them, are associated with socialism. Though not socialist in content, they blend with the general anti-imperialist struggle building up in the bourgeois world, and help to speed up the coming of socialism.

In the light of this it is essential to distinguish the ultimate aims of national movements, depending on the conditions in which they occur. Peoples liberated from, or fighting against, colonial oppression, are aspiring to national independence, national statehood, because the fatherland, to use Lenin's expression, has not yet sung its historical song to the end. The ultimate aim of the liberation struggle of oppressed peoples in developed capitalist countries is different, at least in most cases.

¹ Tim Buck, *Selected Writings (1923-1959)*. *Our Fight for Canada*, Toronto, 1959, p. 307.

² K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* (in 3 volumes), Vol. 1, p. 227.

Here the class approach to the national question is even more essential. It cannot be reduced to mere struggle against the oppressor nation. The years of joint existence in the framework of one state tie the oppressed nation (first and foremost the working masses) to the oppressor nation by a thousand threads. The class struggle against capitalist oppression creates enduring international bonds between the working people of the oppressor and oppressed nations. In such cases, secession of the oppressed people would disrupt the united front of class struggle, renouncing social in favour of only national liberation.

When the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists maintained, shortly before the October Revolution, that their country's secession from Russia was obligatory, Lenin wrote that it "would be a downright betrayal of socialism and a silly policy *even* from the standpoint of the bourgeois 'national aims' of the Ukrainians to *weaken* the ties and the alliance between the Ukrainian and Great-Russian proletariat that now exist within the confines of a single state."¹ This is absolutely valid today in relation to the national question in developed capitalist countries.

In sum, though reaction has grown stronger, imperialism cannot arrest the growth of democratic tendencies among the mass of the people. That is one of the main reasons for the increasing sharpness of national relations in developed capitalist countries.

3. STRUGGLE FOR THE INTERNATIONAL UNITY OF THE WORKING CLASS

To buttress its class rule, the bourgeoisie has a stake in national movements being nationalist. The working class, on the other hand, directs the aspirations of the oppressed people to free economic, cultural and national statehood along a path that reduces to the minimum the bourgeoisie's opportunities for implanting nationalism and separatism. Lenin taught the proletariat to be aware of the dividing line, which, to be sure, is

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 30.

sometimes barely visible and which bourgeois and petty-bourgeois revolutionaries overlook or forget: "Combat all national oppression? Yes, of course! Fight for any kind of national development, for 'national culture' in general?—Of course not."¹ The bourgeoisie must not be allowed in its class interests to impose on the masses of the oppressed nation a blind urge to set up a national state at any cost. Lenin stressed that the "national state" of which bourgeois nationalists speak, implying its one-nation character, is in fact a historically conditioned and transient type of state in the overall capitalist development of mankind.

The example of the Austrian nation shows how diverse in form and complex in content the development of nations in the bourgeois world is today. It is common knowledge that historical events separated the Austrians from the rest of the Germans. This is what conditioned the formation of the Austrian nation. However, after the October Revolution, when opportunities appeared for accelerating this process, the Austrian bourgeoisie, influenced by monopoly capital, in effect refused to promote it. And the Social-Democrat leaders concurred. They advocated a universal revolution of the German people as a whole and came out in favour of *Anschluss*. The ruling circles suppressed all signs of the Austrian people's national consciousness, all attempts to accelerate the formation of a nation.

In this way, the Austrian ruling classes delivered the country to fascism. Karl Renner, leader of the right-wing Social-Democrats, welcomed the country's seizure by the nazis. And Otto Bauer, self-avowed "theorist" of the national question who understood the tragedy of the situation, declared that in the new conditions nothing but defeat of German fascism by the Soviet Union would assure the free development of the German people. What he did not understand, however, was the actual national question in Austria. When the Communist Party maintained after *Anschluss* that an Austrian nation existed, that it was up to the progressive forces to strengthen the national consciousness of the people in order to rally them for the struggle for freedom and national independence,

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 35.

Bauer and the so-called revolutionary socialists, at whose head he stood, opposed this.

After the Second World War, too, people in many ways hostile to their nation's interests, came forward in the new Austria. Until only recently certain individuals in the country continued to scorn the existence of the Austrian nation. Joining hands with West German revenge-seekers, reactionary forces campaigned for *Anschluss*. Attempts were made in defiance of the country's proclaimed neutrality to put Austria into the Common Market. It was only under pressure of the progressive forces, including the Austrian Communists, that the reality of the Austrian nation was finally recognised.

That modern imperialism acts as a brake on the development of old and the formation of new nations may be seen literally at every step. First and foremost, this applies to the economic basis of the emergence of nations. The bulk of the values produced by the people remains in the hands of a negligible handful of capitalists. And this distribution of national wealth has a negative and crippling influence on the intrinsic processes of the development of nations in modern bourgeois society.

In the conditions of monopoly power, the only form of all-national property, Lenin aptly pointed out, is the state debt. And this debt has reached colossal dimensions. Suffice it to compare the state debt with various other "revenue" and "expenditure" items to see how coolly finance capital ignores the economic interests of the nation.¹

The plunder of the national wealth of many countries by foreign monopolies is an illustration of how modern imperialism disrupts the economic basis of nations and nationalities. Often, foreign investments lead to a gradual curtailment of national sovereignty and independence. Lenin pointed out more than once that those who control the economy also control politics. Subordinating one capitalist country after another economically, US imperialism imposes its will on their governments. The national bourgeoisie of many countries, too, deliberately betrays the interests of its people. Matters have

¹ By mid-1970, the US state debt was \$371.5 billion, and by mid-1976 it was over \$600 billion, and its military expenditure amounted to \$117 billion.

reached a point where it relinquishes sovereignty over large parts of its country.¹

The working class rallies all other progressive forces for the defence of national interests. This intertwines with the class struggle, the movement to curb monopoly power and stop the betrayal of national interests by the big bourgeoisie.

Now that the imperialist colonial system has disintegrated and the sphere of investment has shrunk, monopoly capital ignores national interests still more openly than before. The US monopolies have put aside all disguises and have set out to win world supremacy for the United States by penetrating the national economies of many, including highly developed, countries. This explains why the working class and all working people are rising to the defence of national interests. In 1950, US investments in Western Europe were \$1.7 billion, and by the end of 1973 they were \$37.2 billion. Twenty-five per cent of some of the leading industries in Britain are controlled by US monopolies. In the Canadian economy US capital controls from 60 to 80 per cent of the manufacturing, oil, gas, mining and steel industries. Foreign capital, chiefly the US and Japanese monopolies, controls also over 30 per cent of Australia's industrial enterprises.

The working-class movement closely follows these developments. The French Communists, for example, maintain internationalist ties with the working class in other countries, and accord special consideration to the national features of immigrant workers (representing some 60 nationalities). In a country where every fourth worker is an immigrant, and every second immigrant entered the country just a few years ago, it is

The situation in Britain is much the same. Her state debt was £40.124 billion by the end of March 1974. Yet in 1975 the budget earmarked £4.5 billion for military purposes. The US monopolies alone repatriate \$1 billion annually in profits from the British Isles.

¹ Canada's ruling class, for example, placed 2.5 million sq km in the Arctic part of the country at the disposal of US monopolies in the postwar period. Besides, the people of Canada lost title to vast reserves of minerals.

Brazil is another example. Nearly one-fifth of its territory (1.6 million sq km out of 8.5 million) is owned by foreign monopolies, mostly US.

In recent years, US monopolies bought nearly 170 million hectares of the seabed along the coasts of Australia, South America, Mexico, New Zealand, and elsewhere.

important to prevent the capitalist class from disrupting the unity of the working-class movement, and its ties with workers of other countries, through racial and chauvinist discrimination. Many local organisations of the French Communist Party have specially assigned functionaries to work with immigrants. They have organised exchange of experience, and draw immigrants into the unions and the Communist Party. The fraternal parties in the immigrants' native countries help willingly.

Problems related to the migration of manpower, chiefly workers, from one country to another, are important for the national and international processes of our time.¹ Monopoly capital benefits by getting the needed manpower; also, it uses immigrants as a means of pressure against its own workers: foreigners are willing to work on less advantageous terms than local workers, for at home their wages would be still lower. Despite a permanent army of unemployed, the monopolies in little Belgium, for example, have recruited thousands of immigrant workers. In France, the number of unemployed is almost 1.5 million and the number of employed foreign workers exceeds this figure. The bourgeoisie tries to play off the workers of different nationalities against each other, sowing the seeds of nationalism and chauvinism. This is designed to disrupt the united international proletarian front and divert the working class from its main objective: struggle for the overthrow of the capitalist system.

The growing leading role of the working class is an important feature of the national processes in capitalist society. Marx regarded the formation of an industrial proletariat on a national scale as the prime condition for the liberation of the

¹ In the past century, for example, some 1.5 million people left Wales (its present population is something like one million) to settle elsewhere in the British Isles or abroad. Need we say what consequences this had for the development of the people of Wales? Tens of thousands are still leaving Scotland annually in search of a better life. Meanwhile, more than 1.7 million workers born elsewhere have jobs in Britain. In Switzerland, 20 per cent of the labour force are foreigners, while in France they add up to 1.72 million. There is migration of manpower in Africa as well. People, mostly from Malawi, Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland, go to South Africa, where there is a demand for manpower in industry and agriculture.

nation from social and national oppression, and described the seizure of power by the proletariat as a "necessary condition for national salvation".¹

Until the question of power is finally resolved, the leading role of the working class is no more than relative, and is not equivalent to the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is due to the changed conditions of the class struggle, the appearance of specific features in the approach and passage to the socialist revolution, and in the formation of the political army of the revolution.

Ignoring the will of the nation, monopoly capital often leads it along the road to destruction. This is where the working class wins added prestige in the eyes of the nation, being the only class to defend consistently the real national interests. If the bourgeoisie is still able to hold on to power, this is due solely to the fact that it still controls the economy and the political apparatus, and retains its grip on the ideological mass media.

International imperialism plays a big part in keeping the bourgeoisie in power in many a country where the democratic forces headed by the working class endanger its positions. When the guns of the Second World War fell silent, US imperialism went to very great expense to buttress the power of the bourgeoisie in Europe, to suppress the influence of the working class. In Latin America, too, US monopolies combat the people's liberation struggle by installing military dictatorships, by armed intervention, help local reactionaries decimate the working class by means of military coups, and the like. This has been going on for many decades. Suffice it to recall that since Bolivia's independence in 1825, there have been more than 180 coups d'état in her history, instigated as a rule by US capitalism. For the same reason, 87 out of the 96 presidents in Peru were removed from power before their terms expired. American specialists have established that beginning with Greece in 1947 and ending with Vietnam in 1965, the United States dispatched military or paramilitary forces to various countries on an average of every 18 months, in order to overthrow governments, fight guerilla movements, and

¹ Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 17, Berlin, 1968, S. 558.

combat the "communist danger". This has a negative effect on the progress of peoples.

In present conditions, change of a nation's leadership may occur in the framework of a united popular anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly front, that is, before the victory of the socialist revolution. Even though in this front the leading role of the working class is neither complete nor undivided, it is still important, first to unite all the progressive forces of the nation, and then to win the key positions, to win power, to carry out radical social and economic transformations which cumulatively assure passage to socialist revolution.

The trade union movement, especially the Communist-oriented part of it, exercises a strong influence on the world revolutionary process. The national aspects of the movement allow for the use of the power of the international working class a) to defend the freedom and independence of peoples subjected to aggression, b) to help the national liberation movement against colonialism and neocolonialism, and the free peoples to build a new life, and c) to spread the ideology of proletarian internationalism to the national liberation and general-democratic movements.

The national and international processes in the modern bourgeois world depend largely on the successes of the international working class in interdicting nationalism and chauvinism. "Chauvinism," Marx wrote, "is a means of hindering the international cooperation of the working class, which is the prime condition of its liberation."¹ Reaction encourages nationalist ideology, as is made plain by neo-nazism in West Germany, Zionism in Israel, white chauvinism in the USA, and black nationalism, for all its peculiarities, in Africa. Nationalism is described as the hallmark of the age, and as the main weapon against world communism. Anti-communism and the many militarist doctrines are shot through with nationalism.

"The imperialists are well aware of the power of international proletarian solidarity," said Leonid Brezhnev at the 1969 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties. "That is why

¹ *Ibid.*

they bank on nationalism in fighting the socialist forces, the revolutionary movement.”¹

The international working class, its Marxist-Leninist parties, defend national interests, work for the unity of democratic forces, and frustrate the reactionary plans of monopoly capital. By so doing, they exercise a tremendous influence on the national problems of the world revolutionary process, accelerate its development, and bring the ideas of proletarian internationalism to the masses.

The Communist and Workers' Parties counter bourgeois nationalism with proletarian internationalism, the tested weapon of the working class. Their motto is relentless struggle against chauvinism and constant internationalist education of the working class and all working people. It is an important Leninist postulate, tested in class struggle in the imperialist epoch, never to follow the lead of the bourgeoisie in its attempts to give the working class an exaggerated idea of the role of national features, though these must nonetheless be considered. For Lenin, the main task in mankind's historic transition from capitalism to socialism is to anticipate, spot, investigate, study, and grasp the peculiarly national in the *concrete* approach of each country to the *common* international objective, the victory over opportunism and left doctrinairism within the working-class movement, to the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, to the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Successful fulfilment of the national and international tasks of the working class in every country depends invariably on how correctly they are understood and how consistently the national tasks are subordinated to the international.

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 160.

CHAPTER TWELVE

THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT AND THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

1. CORRELATION OF THE NATIONAL AND SOCIAL IN PRESENT-DAY NATIONAL LIBERATION REVOLUTIONS

Over a hundred years ago Marx raised this vitally important question: can humanity move towards progress without a radical revolution in the social conditions of the colonial world? The answer is supplied by the Marxist-Leninist teaching and the real facts—the tasks facing humanity are now being resolved in concert by the peoples of all continents. The degree to which each people is involved depends on the degree to which the international working class succeeds in merging its own struggle against imperialism with the national liberation movement of the oppressed and dependent peoples. Lenin pointed out that “the international proletariat is the only ally of all the hundreds of millions of the working and exploited peoples of the East.”¹ And the 1969 Meeting of Communist and Workers’ Parties made plain that “it is of paramount importance for the prospects of the anti-imperialist struggle to strengthen the alliance between the socialist system, the forces of the working-class movement and national liberation”.²

The alliance between the international working class and the national liberation movement hinges on a variety of factors, and notably a correct approach to the place and role of the national question in countries fighting for liberation. In the national question itself, priority goes to the problem of national relations between the oppressor and oppressed nations.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 162.

² *International Meeting of Communist and Workers’ Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 30.

It is largely in the context of the mutual relations of the oppressor and oppressed nations that national oppression and inequality, and exploitation of one people by another are eliminated, that oppressed and dependent peoples gain freedom, and that the gap between economically developed and backward countries is gradually closed. Those are the objectives, and to cope with them the international working class must overcome the suspicion prevailing between oppressor and oppressed peoples, fuse the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat of the developed capitalist countries with the national liberation struggle of the colonies and dependent countries.

The national liberation movement has achieved tremendous successes. In the larger part of Asia and Africa there is no more outright national-colonial oppression on an international scale. Now over 40 territories with a population of over 20 millions are still under colonial rule. In effect, non-whites in the Republic of South Africa and in South Rhodesia are also under colonial oppression.

The national liberation struggle of the peoples is so eminently successful, because highly favourable conditions have been created for it by the offensive of world socialism and the ceaseless class battles fought in the developed capitalist countries.

National and racial oppression and colonial exploitation—which are built-in features of capitalism—are necessarily more intense when capitalism passes into its final, monopoly phase. It follows that national and colonial oppression, and racism, will not be fully eliminated until capitalism is fully eliminated and socialism emerges victorious. Marxism-Leninism attaches great significance to national liberation movements, and regards them in association with the main objective—the socialist revolution. The idea that the national liberation movement plays a special role is contrary to Marxism-Leninism. Its exponents are unaware of the international situation serving as the setting for the anti-imperialist struggle, and slip into nationalistic inferences. They are blind to the fact that the weakening of imperialism is the result of universal processes, and first and foremost the direct result of

the victory of the October Revolution, of the formation of the Soviet socialist state and, later, the world socialist system.

Provincialism in assessing the historic events testifying to the successes of the world revolutionary process, assured by the favourable combination of internal and external, objective and subjective factors, only distorts the general picture, and leads inevitably to erroneous political conclusions.

To trace the weakening of imperialism exclusively to the national liberation struggle, and to proclaim it the main and decisive revolutionary factor, is to forget that the incontestable victories of that struggle are confined to the least socially and economically developed regions where the objective conditions for socialism, especially an industrial basis, are practically non-existent. The Leninist doctrine of socialist revolution postulates as prerequisites of success in a socialist overturn a combination of subjective and objective conditions, the existence of revolutionary forces and of essential material production resources.

There are those who say that since the developing countries are peasant lands they do not come under the Marxist-Leninist principle of the working class holding the leading place in the revolution. Speaking at the 1969 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Leonid Brezhnev said: "The peasants in that part of the world are a mighty revolutionary force, but in most cases they are an elemental force, with all the ensuing vacillations and ideological and political contradictions. Nor could it have been otherwise for the time being, because the great majority of the peasantry still lives in conditions of monstrous poverty, denial of rights, and surviving feudal and sometimes even prefeudal relations."¹

The peasants can win only under the leadership of the working class, in alliance with the workers. The ranks of the working class are cemented by the objective conditions of their work, which encourage its concentration and engender class solidarity.

Good organisation, firm discipline and strong conviction are qualities mainly of the workers lined up under the Marxist-

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 175.

Leninist banner, and are the criterion of the general revolutionism essential to perform the leading role in the revolutionary movement. The successes of the national liberation struggle of the predominantly peasant countries of the East would have been unthinkable without the revolutionary struggle of the world proletariat and its chief gain — the world socialist system.

It should also be borne in mind that even on defeating foreign colonisers and their domestic agents, the peasants are unable to create new, more progressive social relations without the leadership of the working class. Dispersed by the general conditions of farming and tied to the land, the peasants lack the necessary degree of unity and political consciousness. Take the history of the Taiping rebellion in China in the 19th century. It showed that even on disrupting the feudal or semi-feudal forms of exploitation, the peasants merely reproduced the former social relationships.

Addressing Communists in Eastern countries, Lenin outlined the special aspects of their work among members of the national liberation movement. He said: "In this respect you are confronted with a task which has not previously confronted the Communists of the world: relying upon the general theory and practice of communism, you must adapt yourselves to specific conditions such as do not exist in the European countries; you must be able to apply that theory and practice to conditions in which the bulk of the population are peasants, and in which the task is to wage a struggle against medieval survivals and not against capitalism."¹

He stressed that Communists must find their way "to the working and exploited masses of every country and tell them in a language they understand that their only hope of emancipation lies in the victory of the international revolution".²

This is of the utmost significance today.

Struggle against imperialism, the common enemy of the proletarians, of all working and oppressed peoples, is much more effective if all its participants act together. It would be wrong to oppose the national and social aspects of the struggle,

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 161.

² *Ibid.*, p. 162.

because under imperialism all forms of oppression, including national-colonial oppression, tend to grow more intensive. The international working-class struggle against the capitalist monopolies is inevitably directed against colonialism. The future of the peoples fighting to win or consolidate national independence is linked organically with the perspective of the world's revolutionary transformation along socialist lines.

The international working-class movement is the only one that creates conditions for the achievement of the main objective of the national liberation struggle: the final abolition of national oppression. It undermines the capitalist system and facilitates expansion of the liberation struggle. Also, the working class of the developed capitalist countries fighting against exploitation strives for alliance with the national liberation movement, supporting all the actions of the oppressed peoples and supplying them with revolutionary experience. Furthermore, the countries and peoples that won liberation and embarked on building the new, socialist society as a result of the successes of the international working-class movement and their own dedicated struggle, provide the oppressed and dependent peoples with all possible aid and support. Alliance with the countries of the socialist community is essential for overthrowing colonialism and neocolonialism. Soon after the October Revolution, Lenin pointed out that the revolutionary movement in colonies and dependent countries "can reach a successful issue, only in direct association with the revolutionary struggle of our Soviet Republic against international imperialism."¹

Since the forming of the world socialist system, whereupon capitalism was weakened by the further progress of the world revolutionary process, the international working class has gained new opportunities for aiding the liberation struggle in colonies and dependent countries. First, world socialism has consolidated itself by delivering powerful blows in imperialism's colonial periphery (victory of the Chinese revolution, adoption of socialism by the people of North Korea and North Vietnam). Second, the international working-class movement and the socialist countries have considerably increased their

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 151

economic, political and military aid to the national liberation movement. It is to this aid that this movement owes its impressive results: when capitalism entered the third stage of its general crisis, the imperialist colonial system began disintegrating.

The forming of national states by previously oppressed peoples occupies a central place in the content of the national question in Asia and Africa. The process of national-state construction changed substantially in the postwar period. Usually, national states arise through the maturing of intrinsic national processes nurtured by the development of capitalism. By the time nation-states began to appear in Europe, for example, they always had an economic foundation—the appropriate level of the productive forces and economic ties encompassing the entire population—and by and large, a fully formed national consciousness, and political unity of the people round parties or state bodies. In most European countries, nations had essentially already taken shape, and the national state only accelerated and consummated the process.

These factors were far less evident in Asian and African countries in the postwar period, though, of course, they existed as inevitable consequences of imperialist domination. “One of the main features of imperialism,” Lenin pointed out, “is that it accelerates capitalist development in the most backward countries, and thereby extends and intensifies the struggle against national oppression.”¹ Powerful national movements developed, in some cases leading to wars (Indonesia, Algeria, Vietnam), one of the main aims being to form national states and defend independence. Yet the old way of forming national states was followed, and this only partly, in just a few countries—India, Lebanon, Malaysia, Ceylon, and the Philippines. In most cases, however, the formation of national states followed a different pattern, with a number of special features.

Speaking at the 1969 International Meeting, Leonid Brezhnev singled out three main groups of national states liberated from the colonial yoke.

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 23, p. 78.

First, there are countries of the socialist orientation, whose constitution was an important gain of the revolutionary forces and, conversely, a serious setback for imperialism. By now, these countries have scored their first successes in carrying out deep-going social and economic changes.

Second, there is a group of countries where power was seized by reactionary elements closely associated with imperialism. This was due to a number of objective factors, but also due to a lack of organisation and to the passivity of the progressive forces in the former colonial world. To this group belong military dictatorships, which terrorise the progressive forces. Imperialist states use the territory of many of them for aggressive purposes, notably for building these military bases. The conditions in which the Communists and their allies work in these countries are in many ways similar to those of the colonial period.

Third, there is still another group whose orientation, their further way are not yet entirely clear. An intense struggle is under way there between the progressive forces and imperialist-supported domestic reaction. The internal social differentiation is increasing. The masses are actively demanding changes. But the top national bourgeoisie, motivated by its own class interests, is resisting social progress and a consistent anti-imperialist policy. This gives momentum to sharp class struggle.¹

The present pattern of national-state development is shaped by a whole set of factors. First and foremost, it includes the high level and truly massive character of the national liberation movement, powerfully influenced and assisted by the international working-class movement and the world socialist system. The second factor is that the colonialists can no longer rule as before in this epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism and in face of the national liberation movement. On the one hand, this has helped the oppressed peoples to acquire political independence, and on the other, has resulted in the fact that the colonialists tried to pervert the development of national statehood in at least some of their colonies. In some cases, they

¹ See *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, pp. 152-53.

did not even wait to be expelled, and pretended to leave "voluntarily". But this ploy of "granting" independence, which led to the formation of national states, was paid for dearly by the peoples, because it enabled the colonialists to impose constitutions and rulers of their own choice, thus securing continued control.

In 1920, Lenin pointed out "the need constantly to explain and expose among the broadest working masses of all countries, and particularly of the backward countries, the deception systematically practised by the imperialist powers, which, under the guise of politically independent states, set up states that are wholly dependent upon them economically, financially and militarily".¹ To buttress their positions in the newly-formed states, the British imperialists resorted, and sometimes still resort, to federative unions. The most widespread manner of restricting the national independence of formally liberated ex-colonial peoples is economic: foreign monopolies retain control of industrial and transport enterprises, the newly-free country is incorporated in some monetary zone or tied to some interstate monopoly union (e. g., the union of 21 African states associated with the European Economic Community).

Between 1965 and 1972, the developing countries' foreign debt increased from \$34 billion to \$89 billion, while their debt and debt-interest payments grew from \$2.7 billion to \$7.5 billion.

The third factor behind the peculiar pattern of the postwar formation of national states is the example of the formerly backward peoples of the Soviet Union—an example of peoples which exercised their right to self-determination even in circumstances where the usual pre-conditions for it from the standpoint of European experience were only just maturing. The bourgeoisie always invoked the right of nations to self-determination at the moment when national statehood not simply corresponded to the level society had reached, but when there was also a need to consolidate that level. In the conditions of proletarian dictatorship a people's self-determination, acquisition of national statehood, became a means of rapidly

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 150.

changing that level, of accelerating progress. This is not merely a basic difference in the exercise of the right to self-determination, but also a historic service of the international working class in general, and its Soviet contingent in particular, to the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries.

The correlation between the internal and external, and the economic and ideological factors, has consequently changed. This is due to the fact that the growth of capitalism in colonies and dependent countries differed greatly from its growth in, say, the European countries. The emergence of the national bourgeoisie was slow, and usually still slower to appear was its wish to head the struggle for the national liberation of its people. The national bourgeoisie grew mainly in the service sphere, where it served the colonialists, and not in the sphere of production. Since its positions were strongest in chiefly the administrative apparatus, or in subsidiary and insignificant fields of production and among the intelligentsia, the emergence of a bourgeoisie no longer led, or at least visibly contributed, to the emergence of an industrial proletariat. Hence, the proletariat appeared chiefly as the antipode of foreign capital, not of the local bourgeoisie.

Therefore, the liberation struggle of peoples no longer depended exclusively on the maturing of internal factors, but also on a number of external ones: help from the international working-class movement and the world socialist system; the changing correlation of world forces in favour of socialism; the scale of the national liberation movement in the more developed regions of the colonial empire. And since this external influence was largely ideological, the significance of the revolutionary-democratic intelligentsia increased greatly. This is why in many cases it was the latter rather than the national bourgeoisie or the working class (in many countries, in fact, there had been no working class as an independent political force when the national liberation movement began and national states were formed) that assumed leadership of the national liberation movement and, subsequently, of the national state.

In most countries that had been part of imperialism's colonial system nations had not yet formed when national states were constituted (this excludes a number of nations in

India, the Egyptian and Algerian nations, and some others). The distinctive feature of these national states, therefore, is that they were the means of building the nation. So the type of nation that evolved depended on many objective factors and on who—which class or stratum—controlled state power and selected its orientation. Where power fell to the national bourgeoisie, it worked for the country's development along capitalist lines and the nation evolved as a capitalist nation. Where the leadership fell to the revolutionary democrats choosing a non-capitalist way, the new nations were of a transitional nature.

Ridding themselves of colonialist bondage, the peoples in colonies and dependent countries fight for the formalisation of their national statehood. The transfer of power to the indigenous population is a very acute question at present in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, and a few other countries.

The peoples reject the colonialist claim that they are not ready for independence and incapable of governing themselves.

How highly the peoples of the East cherish freedom and national independence may be seen from the long struggle of the Kurds of Iraq. For historical reasons, the Kurds were settled in three countries, but only in the north of Iraq did they succeed in preserving their identity, and retained the will to fight for national independence. Neither force of arms nor economic blockade could compel the Kurdish mountain settlements to abandon their legitimate demand for autonomy in the framework of the Arab Iraqi Republic. And the imperialists exploited the internal strife in Iraq. However, in 1970 the democratic anti-imperialist forces in Iraq finally succeeded in reaching a cease-fire agreement and recognised the national autonomy of the Kurds within the united Iraqi state.

The constitution of states with a non-capitalist orientation is introducing many new elements into national-state development in Asia and Africa. Imperialism is frantically trying to abort this process. And in a few countries it has succeeded in terminating non-capitalist development for a time by means of military coups. Assisted by the Israeli aggressors, world

reaction is also trying to prevent a number of Arab countries from following the new road.

But the new is hewing its way forward: one after another, the newly-liberated peoples break with capitalism and set their course on socialism. True, the process is long and complicated, because the regrouping of class forces is extremely difficult in the new stage of the national liberation revolution. The popular masses are insufficiently active for its consummation. What is needed is an extended development of democracy and a stronger working-class influence. "But whatever the difficulties," as Leonid Brezhnev said, "they cannot minimise the importance of the cardinal fact that a start has been made in a fundamentally new direction for the development of the newly independent countries."¹

After the formation of national states in Asian and African countries, the second cardinal problem in the content of the national question is the formation of nations and nationalities, and the establishment of equal cooperation and mutual assistance. This was extremely difficult to achieve, mainly because of the low level of development, especially in Africa and Oceania, at the time the peoples there were drawn into the historical stream of universal progress.

The many centuries of colonial oppression destroyed civilisations that had been highly developed for their time. Only the peoples in the north of Africa and a few of the Asian peoples were encompassed by capitalist relations, so that the formation of nations had begun there by the time of independence, though it was still far from complete. The development of the other African peoples, on the other hand, was artificially arrested. Roughly a hundred million people had been shipped out of colonies as slaves, and tens of millions had fallen in the struggle against the colonialists. At the time of its colonisation Africa was inhabited by one-third of the world population. Three centuries later this had decreased to only one-tenth. It is difficult to estimate what effect this had on the natural development of peoples. Many of them were exterminated, the remnants of others had moved to less favourable areas. The process of the mixing of the peoples, which Lenin

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, p. 173.

described as progressive in the conditions of capitalist development, was nothing less than tragic in these circumstances, because it was accompanied by additional, all too often mutual, extermination, which caused the death of many who had survived the mortal struggle against the colonialists.

The oppression of Asian and African peoples was aggravated by the fact that in the 18th and 19th centuries they were divided by borders whose demarcation depended on the time the colonialists established their power, or even on the whim of the local rulers. As a result, many nationalities and tribes were fragmented, sometimes into as many as eight parts, and were compelled to live within the same administrative frameworks with peoples to whom they had had no earlier connection, or to whom they had even been hostile. Naturally, this upset the processes of internal development and the convergence of nationalities and tribes.

The economic, political and cultural development of colonial peoples benefited little from the fact that their conquerors were more civilised. Civilisation, in fact, told more on the swiftness of extermination than on development. The fact that the colonialists imported bourgeois, that is, for their time progressive, relations of production and a higher order of the productive forces did not alter matters either. Capitalist relations spread to only a very small section of the urban population and had a negligible effect on the life of the vast majority of the rural population, where, in many cases, the primeval communal system was conserved for centuries. True, an educated stratum did appear in many of the countries, and the formation of the working class did begin. But this merely reflected the needs of the colonialists, rather than their concern for the development of the enslaved peoples.

Regardless of the extent of colonisation, the colonists rarely fused with the local population. Only in some places in Latin America did there appear a mixed racial type of whites and natives. The language of these newly-formed nations was mainly that of the newcomers; and their national culture, too, was shaped under the latter's determinative influence. Of course, it was not due to the goodwill of the colonists, but by virtue of the special historical conditions, that new nations evolved on the American continent in the 19th century, and

also that their development, including the formation of national statehood, was relatively more rapid than that of the African and most of the Asian continents. Yet here, too, most of the indigenous population was not drawn into the general course of progress and, in fact, was doomed to extinction.

On all continents, and notably in most of Africa, the power of the colonialists in the politico-administrative sense was a shaky superstructure leaning for support on military garrisons and the economic pillars, but also strongly dependent on intertribal strife deliberately incited and sustained to impede the development of the local population and to preclude their unity against the intruders. Moreover, the colonialists frequently showed preference not to the main local nationality or tribe, but to a minority group, from which they recruited their personnel—the petty officials, police, etc. France, for example, picked almost exclusively natives of Dahomey for the petty bureaucratic posts in its many African colonies, but at the same time closed access to them to the army, police, and the like.

The break-up of the imperialist colonial system failed to destroy all elements of national oppression even in countries that won sovereign and independent states.

The formalisation of national statehood is only the very beginning of the abolition of inequality, subordination and political, economic and ideological dependence on the imperialist powers. "Finance capital," Lenin wrote, "is such a great, such a decisive, you might say, force in all economic and in all international relations, that it is capable of subjecting, and actually does subject, to itself even states enjoying the fullest political independence."¹ The objective necessity for eliminating this subjection adds urgency to the national problem, and often gives it precedence over all other factors in the relations between developing countries and other states. It is not a question of just economic inequality, but of a predominance of foreign monopoly in the economy of many countries. There is national inequality in the fact that these countries experience a lack or shortage of competent specialists in various fields of the economy, in the cultural domain, and in the government. As a result, the imperialist "masters" of yesteryear retain

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 259.

their hold on personnel training in many a sovereign national state. These states are thus exposed to foreign influence and are denied the chance of conducting a fully independent national policy.

Absence of the necessary educational establishments compels them to send their young people abroad, mainly to what had only a few years before been their metropolitan country. This is the effect of a tradition stemming from familiarity with its language, and also the effect of the political line of the imperialist powers, which offer easy terms in order to educate personnel for the developing countries to suit their own ends. As a result, the imperialists hope to obtain dependable bearers of their influence, people who would turn political independence into a fiction.

The cultural inequality, the monopolisation of scientific and technological achievements by foreign specialists or suitably brainwashed local cadres, is one of the essential aspects of the situation in many, if not most, politically independent but underdeveloped national states.

Naturally, this gives rise to a definite reaction. State sovereignty is intimately related to national self-assertion and concern for national consolidation.

Economic pressure and military blackmail only slightly disguised by hypocritical talk about the need for "joint defence" against communism, comprise a long chain of aggressive imperialist actions against peoples aspiring to liberty. This shows that the national liberation struggle does not end after the collapse of the colonial system. Sometimes it becomes even sharper, because imperialists do not hesitate to resort to extreme measures to prevent progressive social changes in the newly independent countries.

2. THE PROCESSES OF NATIONAL CONSOLIDATION

The successes of the national liberation movement are reflected in many fields in the life of the peoples, notably the processes of national consolidation.

In many of the Asian and African countries the most active participants in building the national state were the urban strata that had earlier supplied services to the colonialists. This meant

that the politicians and bureaucracy were often pro-colonialist, as a result of which national statehood was no more than formal. And since in many countries the colonialists had leaned on just one of the nationalities, frequently a minority, the new state did not in such cases embody the will of the majority. Lastly, in the course of the national liberation movement, whether it embraced the majority of the population or not, the growth of national consciousness was retarded in many countries by tribal strife. In some cases, in fact, it became even more acute than before.

Naturally, the colonialists did not sit on their hands. They did their utmost to frustrate the processes of national consolidation, to prevent evolution of the people's unity.

One of the first negative effects of the formation of new national states was the mass resettlement of the nationally and politically discriminated nationalities and tribes. Take Ruanda, where the Tutsi, a minority comprising 16.6 per cent of the population, had been predominant under the colonialists, and managed to install their monarch on the country's throne. In due course, however, the majority, who belong to the Hutu tribe, overthrew the Tutsi, with the result that most of the latter (more than 150,000) fled the country and represent a constant source of trouble along its borders. Furthermore, seeking asylum in neighbouring Burundi, the Tutsi have seriously complicated national relations in that small country.

Another example is Nigeria. The Ibo of the eastern part of the country had for years supplied the bulk of the personnel for the British colonial administration. After the country gained independence, they were in control of the state apparatus, the army command, retail trade, and the like. Back in the colonial days several million Ibo had moved to other parts of the country, including the north. When during the liberation movement the national feelings of the local population became sensitive, the people who had come from the Eastern Region were the first to feel it. Several million Ibo had no choice but to go back to the east, where, goaded by the imperialists, they soon proclaimed the separatist state of Biafra. As a result, the country was engulfed in an internecine war.

There are dozens of similar examples that show how complicated are the processes of national consolidation in

Africa and certain parts of Asia and Oceania. What makes matters worse is that imperialism changed its policy towards underdeveloped peoples only on the surface. In substance, it has remained the same. The representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties at the 1969 Meeting, jointly with scholars and public organisations of different countries, drew up an Indictment of Imperialism, citing shocking facts about the plunder and the physical extermination of peoples of colonies and dependent countries, including newly independent states. In the postwar years alone, the colonialists fought 34 wars against peoples trying to shake off the imperialist yoke. Some of these wars are still on. The imperialists' "civilising" mission may be illustrated by the fact that in the 1960s foreign investment profits have more than doubled, and some \$23 billion in the profits were exported from other countries in the second half of the 1960s alone. This tendency towards growing gets stronger, rather than weaker.

Deliberate extermination is still the lot of entire peoples today. Many of the aboriginal peoples on the American continent are doomed to extinction. In Brazil, for example, only one out of 25 Indians still survives, and only one out of 32 in Colombia. In 1968 the world press reported that members of Brazil's Indian Protection Service had almost completely exterminated seven tribes in order to take possession of their fertile land. There is brutal extermination of Indians also in Paraguay, Colombia and certain other Latin American countries. In Australia, the number of aborigines has shrunk to one-sixth of what it was.

How imperialism retards the development of smaller peoples is revealed by the fact that in many cases even the language is on the plane of a tribal community and cannot meet the people's need for communication; to all intents and purposes, these peoples have neither a written language nor a literature, or writing is just in the early formative stage.

Many peoples are at so low a level of development that due to backwardness they cannot use their vast natural wealth for their own needs. This invites imperialist plunder. It is in this way that vast oilfields in the Middle East and some of the most fertile land in Latin America fell into the hands of colonialists.

The rule of private property is a brake on the cultural progress of the peoples. Priceless treasures of national culture are bought up for a song and shipped out by capitalists.

Public education is in a lamentable state. In most underdeveloped countries the bulk of the people are illiterate. In Africa 80-85 per cent of the population can neither read nor write. Literacy is also low in some Latin American countries. In Guatemala the percentage of illiteracy has even gone up due to growth of population: it was 71.9 per cent in 1950, and is now over 80 per cent.

It is still worse with trained personnel. Out of the few specialists trained at home many are, moreover, lured to the highly developed countries. Charles V. Kidd, Secretary of the US Office of Science and Technology, admitted that the drain of the scientific élite from the developing countries amounts, in a sense, to a national disaster.¹

The tragedy is that long colonial rule has left the peoples in the backward countries and continents 80-100 years behind the industrially developed capitalist states. The aggregate income of the developing countries, peopled by two-thirds of the world population, is only slightly more than one-tenth that of the industrially developed states. UN and other estimates show that, provided capital retains its power, the next several decades will inevitably see the gap widen still more: by virtue of the scientific and technological revolution the advanced states will leap forward, while the backward, even with a fair annual accretion in production, will, in effect, mark time due to their population growth.

Experts estimate that the gap in the average national per capita income increased from 8.4 times in 1953 to 16 times in 1973. Bourgeois researchers estimate that with the present US average per capita income 7.5 times higher than in South America and 18 times higher than in Africa, the gap by the year 2000 will widen to 12.5 times in the case of South America and as much as 22 times of Africa.

The UN Economic Commission for Africa estimates that at present growth rates, the continent's per capita income will

¹ Ch. V. Kidd, "L'essor scientifique et la répartition des hommes de science entre les nations", *Impact*, 1964, Vol. XIV, No. 1, p. 10.

equal that of Britain and France in 273 years, and that of the United States in 343 years.

This background to the current processes of national consolidation in the life of the newly independent peoples is the cause of some specific features of the formation of nations and nationalities in, first and foremost, some of the African countries.

The linguistic processes, for example, are highly specific, and in many ways unique. In Africa, some emerging nations still use the language brought there by the colonialists. This is true of Ghana, Guinea, Mali and some other countries. True, the brought-in language will not necessarily become the language of the nation when it finally completes its formative process. Besides, it is used in the setting of national statehood. It serves the needs of the formative stage and the development of the nation only until a single national language of all the nationalities and tribes emerges on the basis of the local dialects. In some countries, such as Tunisia, Sri Lanka, Mauritania and Malaysia, a local language is already being introduced as the official language alongside the "alien" tongue. In Malaysia, a nine-year transitional period has been set in a number of areas, during which all institutions and offices are to go over from English to Malay. In Pakistan, Urdu is used alongside English as the official language, and the same is the case with Bengali in Bangladesh. Somali was declared the sole official language in Somalia since the end of 1972, where priorly Italian, English and Arabic were also used.

But it is quite possible that due to inter-tribal antagonisms, or to an "equibalance" of the tribal languages, the tongue of the former colonialists may in some countries consolidate itself as the language of the nation. This has occurred before, as in Latin America. In some cases, too, the language of a neighbouring people is chosen as the official tongue. In Uganda, for example, Swahili was substituted for English following a national referendum in the summer of 1973, for it is neutral from the standpoint of domestic politics and widespread in the neighbouring countries of Eastern Africa.

The fact that in Africa the formation of new nations occurs in many cases despite the still very weak economic consolidation of nationalities and tribes, is also a peculiar feature. On the

other hand, the burgeoning national consciousness of the people comes to the fore as a subjective factor. Rather than ethnic community, it is based on society's need for unity in the struggle against colonialists, the need for joint building of a national state, of its apparatus and army. The national state is one of the principal and decisive factors in the formation of the nation, its economic policy playing an especially important role.

The formation of nations in the environment of developing capitalism depends on the historical features of the country, the political situation, and many other factors. In Mexico, for example, considerable advances have been observed in the convergence of the indigenous population and later settlers. In neighbouring Guatemala, on the other hand, the Latins and Indians are still two isolated, only very loosely connected, groups. The Indians, numbering over 1.8 million, have been pushed back to the mountain plateaus and are actually excluded from the country's economic and cultural, to say nothing of its political, life. They consist of 23 ethnic groups, each with its own language, its own way of life, traditions, and so forth. In the United States, there are only about 800,000 Indians, more than two-thirds of whom live in reservations. They have been almost completely ousted from all spheres of the country's life. Unemployment among them is 45 per cent, and family incomes just one-fifth of the country's average. Only 18 per cent have a secondary school education.

Highly peculiar processes of national consolidation are observed in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, where apartheid borders on genocide. In face of racist police persecution, there is growing unity among the indigenous population, on the one hand, and a widening chasm between the Black majority and white minority, on the other. In South Africa, no trace is seen of any crystallisation into one nation of the white settlers (3.5 million), the indigenous population (13.5 million) and the Asian settlers (0.5 million). On the contrary, the racist government is doing all it can to arrest the development of the country's true masters, who have been allotted a mere 13.7 per cent of the most infertile land. As in South Africa, Ian Smith's racist white minority regime in Southern Rhodesia is, in fact, a variety of fascism.

In the present conditions, the inception of nations in some of the African and Asian countries cannot be completely identified with victory of capitalist over feudal relations. New nations are brought into existence by the elimination of the colonial system, which had retarded the development of the enslaved peoples. And since the colonial system is an outgrowth of capitalism, new nations emerge in a setting of the latter's actual discreditation. It would therefore be incorrect to describe all newly constituted nations in the young developing countries as capitalist nations. In many countries new nations take shape on an anti-imperialist basis. Liberation from imperialism facilitates the national consolidation of peoples whose development had been artificially retarded by colonialism, and leads to the integration of tribes and nationalities, to a maturing of objective conditions for the evolution of new nations.

This process is extremely complicated and intrinsically conflicting. The situation in India is a graphic example: not only fully-fledged large nations, but also ethnic communities which have a tendency to consolidate into nations and are subjected to an intensive process of assimilation, have crystallised therein in the framework of one state. The making of new nations in countries freed from colonial oppression is not over.

In some African countries the crystallisation of new nations is held up by the extensive presence of semi-feudal and tribal relations. Violent tribal conflicts in some of them hampers national consolidation. Home and foreign reactionary forces are trying to exploit tribal, religious, caste and other distinctions to delay the objective formation of nations. Local reaction (the feudal lords, tribal chiefs, and part of the priesthood) regards this progressive process as a threat to its privileges.

The chances of the burgeoning nations' further development depend greatly on their social structure. In most of the developing countries the working class is numerically small. As a rule, the colonialists leave the liberated peoples a very narrow industrial base adapted to the egoistic interests of the metropolitan country. The workers are mostly agricultural proletarians—plantation workers and farm labourers. The majority are unskilled, and a large section illiterate. Due to these objective conditions the working class in most of the

developing countries has not yet assumed its due place as leader of the national anti-imperialist struggle.

But a tendency towards growth of the working class in percentage to the total population and in role is evident in almost all the Asian and African countries. Even though relatively slow, the growth of industry, transport and communications, and the development of natural wealth, are tending to augment the numbers of the proletariat.

The 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties stressed that alongside numerical growth "in a number of young states the social role and political activity of the working class have increased. The importance of international ties between the young proletariat of the countries of Asia and Africa and the working class of the socialist countries and the capitalist states is growing."¹

This is confirmed by the facts. For example, the working class is an active force in the Arab peoples' struggle against the Israeli aggression and in breaking down the resistance of reaction inside some of the Arab countries. At present, national trade unions are uniting on the scale of the entire African continent.

Eager to secure its profits, the national bourgeoisie in the developing countries has a natural interest in unimpeded development of national industries, commerce, and the crafts. This is why most of it is opposed to foreign political or economic domination, which hems in such development. At the same time, however, the national bourgeoisie wants the capitalist principles to gain ground, so as to assure its freedom of exploiting labour. The duality of this position, its intrinsic contradiction, are typical of the national bourgeoisie. It is wrong, therefore, to completely write off the revolutionary potential of the national bourgeoisie or to portray it as a reactionary force that always retards the national liberation struggle. It is a mistake to assume that the national bourgeoisie would necessarily, in all circumstances, betray the national interests and come to terms with imperialism. But it is just as wrong to exaggerate its revolutionary potential, to think that it

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 28.

is always, at all stages, a consistent champion of national interests against imperialist encroachment, and always capable of taking progressive social and economic measures jointly with the working masses.

The eminent success of national liberation revolutions, the break-up of the colonial system and the formation of several dozen new national states in Asia and Africa, coupled with progressive socio-economic transformations in some of them, have given rise to certain illusions about the revolutionary potential of the national bourgeoisie, whose members assumed leadership in many of the new national states. Nationalism became the ideology and official political doctrine wherever this was the case.

It is a Leninist postulate that the progressiveness of liberation movements waving the national flag is measured from the concrete historical angle.

Lenin pointed out that "the awakening of the masses from feudal lethargy, and their struggle against all national oppression, for the sovereignty of the people, of the nation, are progressive. Hence, it is the Marxist's *bounden* duty to stand for the most resolute and consistent democratism on all aspects of the national question".¹ But here the unsurpassed master of revolutionary dialectics, stressed: "This task is largely a negative one. But this is the limit the proletariat can go to in supporting nationalism, for beyond that begins the 'positive' activity of the *bourgeoisie* striving to *fortify* nationalism."²

Obviously, interpreting the class policy of the national bourgeoisie as being always "national" is incompatible with the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. Objectively, it tends to vindicate the bitter repression of Communists and other democratic forces in some of the developing countries by governments of the national bourgeoisie on the pretext of "struggle for national unity". The tragic events in Indonesia and the mass terror against Communists and all progressive organisations in Sudan took place under the nationalist flag. The Address of the 1969 International Meeting said rightly that the dictatorial

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 34.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 34-35.

military regime in Indonesia was conducting an *anti-national* policy.

The only correct principle in assessing the role of classes, including that of the national bourgeoisie, is the historical principle. To measure the revolutionary or reactionary potential of a social stratum it is first necessary to establish the historical stage of the country concerned, its socio-economic level, and the degree of activity and organisation of the masses.

If a country is oppressed by foreigners and compelled to fight for national independence, against imperialism, and if it is burdened with feudal survivals that retard and cripple its economic growth, it is not only the labouring masses, but also the national bourgeoisie, with a stake in free enterprise, that is liable to play a certain revolutionary part. It participates in the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle, though to an extent it depends mainly on the activeness of the masses — the working class and peasantry. But, taking part in the national struggle, the bourgeoisie tries to restrict and control the activity of the masses, to seize the leading role, in order to benefit unilaterally from the results of national liberation and the abolition of the more inconvenient feudal structures. Lenin stressed that frequently even before national self-determination is exercised, "the bourgeoisie of the oppressed countries, while it does support the national movement, is in full accord with the imperialist bourgeoisie, i.e., joins forces with it against all revolutionary movements and revolutionary classes".² On coming to power and attaining its aims, the national bourgeoisie tries to pass off its own class interests as those of the "entire nation".

The anti-imperialist struggle is aimed first and foremost at ending national oppression, recovering or consolidating national independence. No one can argue against that.

Protracted colonial oppression is bound to sharpen national feelings to the extreme, to cause oversensitive reactions to any slights to the national interests or rights of the young sovereign state. The wish to assert the national rights trampled

¹ See *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 53.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 242.

upon by foreign exploiters may result in opposing one's nation to others, in national claims to "exclusiveness". As a result, the natural and law-regulated process of national consolidation in a setting of continuous imperialist encroachments on the sovereign rights of developing countries may, in certain conditions—if the bourgeoisie is ideologically dominant—give rise to nationalism.

Like other propertied classes, the bourgeoisie is interested in using the objectively growing "national" indignation against external imperialist pressure to consolidate its own positions by directing that indignation into nationalist channels. What it achieves thereby, first, is a national "unity", an illusory community of interests of the exploited and the exploiters, which helps to keep the masses in ideological subjection, and, second, additional bargaining counters vis-à-vis the imperialist monopolies, wheedling from them relatively more profitable terms for the local exploiting élite.

If the ideological and political leadership remains in the hands of the national bourgeoisie for any significant length of time, the influence on the formation of the nation is unmistakable.

The intermediate, petty-bourgeois strata and the intelligentsia play a prominent part in national consolidation. Upholding the traditions of their native culture, such as those of the national language, the local intelligentsia seeks deliverance from the cultural monopoly of foreigners. It is critical of the ideological currents flowing from the former metropolitan country, and produces new, peculiar ideological conceptions and programmes of social change.

The progressive elements of the revolutionary-democratic strata of the developing countries have formed several dozen types of parties fighting against imperialism and for social progress, and playing an important role in the liberation movement. Certainly, it is impossible to secure the unity of the anti-imperialist front and the successful growth of national liberation revolutions through deep-going social and political changes without close cooperation and joint action by all the patriotic forces, and first of all the Marxist-Leninist and revolutionary-democratic parties. The 1969 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties also called attention to the need

for closer contacts between the Marxists-Leninists of the socialist and developed capitalist countries and the revolutionary-democratic parties of Asia and Africa. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union can be held up as an example in this respect, for it has contacts with more than 20 such parties.

In a few cases, when different, and even opposite, ideological influences merge, revolutionary democrats are liable to produce intricate blends of archaic religious and philosophic notions with modern progressive views. As a rule, they hold up a nationalism of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois type, often religiously coloured, as the ideological banner.

Since the population in the developing countries is mainly rural, the social environment is conducive to the spread of nationalist views and prejudices. The essentially progressive national protest generated by the imperialists' anti-national practices, often acquires a nationalist complexion due to bourgeois influence, the political immaturity of the masses, or poor educational work by the proletarian vanguard.

The national consolidation of the newly liberated peoples coincides in time with changes in the correlation of the national and the social in the present stage of the national liberation movement. This correlation depends on many factors—the development of the people, the stage of the liberation struggle and on the classes and strata heading the struggle.

At the height of the battle to eliminate foreign oppression and win political independence all the classes and strata were united by the common national tasks, the main one being to secure the right to self-determination and to constituting a national state. The liberation struggle for general national objectives is influenced mainly by nationalism, by the intricate blend in it of the democratic and the reactionary: the reflection of the growing national consciousness of the people and the ideas expressing the interests of the national bourgeoisie, the tribal gentry or feudal aristocracy, the revolutionary-democratic intelligentsia and the working masses; the nationalism bred by local conditions and that brought in from outside.

It stands to reason that nationalism should not be exculpated by specific national features. Certainly, the national features of a country protecting its rights and interests against imperialist

monopoly must be taken into account if we want to understand what is happening. But they must not be treated as an absolute or opposed to the interests of equitable cooperation with other peoples, to the united action of the anti-imperialist forces across the world.

The disintegration of the colonial system has changed the correlation of forces in the world. In many cases, socialist countries form a united front with the new sovereign states built on the ruins of the colonial empires. Like the socialist countries, the developing states stand for world peace and against the designs of the imperialist powers to gain world supremacy and spark a world nuclear war. True, there is a large variety of concrete social, economic and political conditions in the various developing countries.

Yet the fact that several dozen new sovereign Asian and African states have become members of the United Nations and of many other international organisations, is evidence of imperialism's decline and the collapse of its attempts to throttle the national liberation movement.

The national superceded the social and class elements during the struggle for the general national objectives, just as the democratic superceded the reactionary in nationalism. This is why the progressive forces, including the Marxist-Leninist parties wherever they already existed, supported movements headed by nationalists, though temporarily and within strictly designated limits.

Even when the national predominates, the social and class elements should not be ignored. They are important, because the struggle of the oppressed peoples against imperialism is necessarily and largely a class struggle against oppression in general. It depends on the size of the movement and the involvement of the masses whether the class element is afforded a more or less prominent place. But it is always present in the struggle. After political independence, there is an intensive class differentiation even in the most backward countries, and since the country must at this time make its choice of the way of development, the social factors come to the forefront. This, indeed, impels the evolution of nationalism, the content of which now depends on the correlation of class forces.

As Lenin predicted, the national bourgeoisie launches "positive" activity for nationalism in countries where it comes to power. The progressive forces, on the other hand, including the revolutionary-democratic elements, lay the main accent in nationalism on its general democratic content, which does not cease playing its positive role of promoting national consolidation and the formation of the nation after the country's liberation.

Take a closer look at the evolution of nationalism in the developing countries, and at the changes in the content of the national question during a people's passage to the non-capitalist way.

The evolution of nationalism is impelled first and foremost by the sharpening of social and class contradictions during a people's development in general, and when it faces the choice of way, in particular. Here, nationalism—often in a developing country the ideology and policy both for solving the general national problems and for society's reconstruction—gives precedence in its content to the social. A class differentiation occurs among the bearers of nationalism. Some move wholly to the reactionary position in nationalism, while others try to tie in the democratic element in nationalism with radical democratic social changes.

Arab nationalism, for example, notably in the case of the Arab Republic of Egypt, has developed in a highly contradictory way over the past ten years or so. Those classes and sections that represented the general democratic content of nationalism and championed the interests of the mass of the people, sought unity in order to assure the country's progressive development. The elements associated with the feudal gentry and the rightist segment of the national bourgeoisie, on the other hand, espoused the reactionary content of Arab nationalism and entered into contact with foreign imperialism to prevent the country from taking the non-capitalist way. Regrettably, for the time being the reactionary content in Arab nationalism has taken the upper hand in the Arab Republic of Egypt. The Egyptian leaders have accepted separate deals with Israel and its patrons. Their conclusion, says the Soviet Government statement of March 31, 1976, was concealed from the true friends of the Egyptian people and was transacted

behind the backs of the Arab countries opposing the aggressor. This has in effect excluded Egypt from the front of struggle for the liberation of occupied Arab territories.

The peculiar thing about the evolution of nationalism in countries of the national liberation zone is that even followers of its democratic trend often espouse national exclusiveness and the idea of a "special way" for their country or the whole continent. Whether its exponents want it or not, this is bound to lead to self-isolation, to disruption of the unity of the liberated peoples, so necessary in face of the imperialists' neocolonialist designs.

It should be borne in mind that narrow nationalism is being propagated in countries of small size. In Africa, for example, one out of every five new national states has a population of less than one million, and about half of the others have only between one and five million. Consequently, their general backwardness combines with an acute shortage of manpower essential for rapid development. It is not surprising, therefore, that after centuries of enslavement and retarded development these small nations often fall prey to neocolonialists.

The exponents of narrow nationalism could not care less about the situation in other countries and the subversive imperialist activity there, thus giving the imperialists a free hand. Precisely this was one of the reasons why domestic and foreign enemies of freedom are the engineers of numerous military coups in Africa. It is quite obvious that so long as the masses are not duly involved in the administration of the national state and the defence of its gains, the subversive activity of foreign imperialists and local reactionaries should not be regarded as the internal affair of any one country.

There are many remedies. Tanganyika and Zanzibar, for example, merged on an equal footing and created a new state, Tanzania, in which each of the peoples retained its national statehood. Regional alliances are frequent, providing for various forms of cooperation among the liberated peoples. But these unions are effective only if they have an anti-imperialist basis and if the popular masses are enlisted to participate in their development. In the absence of this, there can be discontent among the masses, as well as among the individual affiliated states, and a return to isolation.

The imperialists, as history shows, regard nationalism, which divides the peoples, as the most promising means of diverting countries from the progressive way. Ghana, which had done a lot for African unity, and which followed the non-capitalist way, was alone when its progressive regime came under the fire of foreign imperialism and home reaction.

The idea that national states cannot be instruments of progress in the present stage of liberation from imperialism, is incorrect. Yet this, precisely, is the viewpoint of the journal *Africa and the World*, which described the national state in the era of mounting economic internationalisation as an anachronism. The national state is still a mover of social progress. The intensity of national and international processes in the life of a people depends largely on its strength and the support it gets from the masses. Though, of course, national states should not be built on the basis of narrow nationalism. The journal is right when it says that the young national states must reassess the policy of nationalism and work for closer unity. Moreover, in these circumstances unity is not just the most suitable type of relationship between national states in face of imperialism and internal difficulties, but also an important social factor of progress.

The non-capitalist way of development is an important means of progress and, in some measure, of resolving the national question. It assures solution of national development problems because, first and foremost, it helps get rid of the domination and the debilitating influence of foreign capital, and unite the country's population to achieve the essential socio-economic objectives. The non-capitalist way provides for a state sector in the economy, and, hence, for a rapid growth of the national working class, whose role in society, therefore, expands steadily. Moreover, the non-capitalist way stands for a socialist orientation, which is impossible without a gradual expansion of links between the young national states and the world socialist market. And cooperation with the socialist countries helps immensely to resolve the crucial socio-economic problems, and promotes national consolidation and national relations in general.

It is clear, therefore, that the non-capitalist way intensifies the national and international processes in the developing

countries. The common objectives of progress, on the one hand, and broad democratisation of society, on the other, pave the way for the unity of different ethnic groups, for national consolidation and the formation of the nation. The rapidly growing national working class, influenced by the international working-class movement and the world socialist system, begins to exercise an ever greater influence on the formation of the nation, on its image and social structure. The role of national statehood increases. The state begins to lean for support on the masses, and the masses, in turn, take a bigger part in the administration of the country. In this way the state becomes an instrument for building the new life, leading the liberated peoples to progress and socialism, and to the emergence of a transition-type nation.

The concept "transition-type nation" is relative and does not mean that there is some third type of nation in between the capitalist and the socialist. It only identifies nations that are in the process of transition from the former to the latter type.

We need this new concept due to the appearance in the Third World countries of complex phenomena that cannot be fitted into old and familiar schemes. These transition-type nations should evidently be referred to those transitional social and political phases in the development of society that have made their appearance only recently. It is obvious that these days there are entirely real and qualitatively new processes of national consolidation unfolding when the choice between the socialist and capitalist orientation has not yet been made either theoretically or politically.

This new concept seems to be valid in two cases.

First, when nations that are either fully or essentially formed, opt for the non-capitalist way before they reach the stage of mature capitalism. This applies, for example, to the Syrian, Algerian and Egyptian nations. The fact that they chose the socialist orientation before capitalism had matured in the country, caused a certain modification in intra-national ties, which began to acquire a new social essence before the national-democratic revolution was consummated and before the victory of the proletarian revolution.

The second case in which the concept "transition-type nation" may be used is more relative and applies to those

socialist-oriented countries of Asia and Africa in which nations had not yet taken shape before colonialism was overthrown. The processes of national consolidation that began in the course of the national liberation movement were capitalist only in the very beginning. As the progressive social and economic reconstruction gained pace in the setting of non-capitalist development, these processes diverged farther and farther from the capitalist. But for some time still, practically until the victory of the proletarian revolution, they will not be socialist. It is highly probable, however, that nations will, in the main, take shape in these countries. And in social essence they will definitely be nations of a transitional type.

In recent years, the ruling parties and governments of some developing countries began using the term "nation" to describe the usually ethnically diverse population of their land. And it must be admitted that the degree of anti-imperialist unity, and of national and political unity in the battle for social progress, is now incomparably higher than at the time of liberation. Moreover, for all the importance and peculiarity of the economic factors behind this unity (many different modes of production, the growing role of the state sector alongside the continued existence of private property, expansion of economic ties among the young national states and between them and the world socialist market), the determining role is still in the beginning played by political and ideological factors.

The social essence of a transition-type nation naturally depends on the maturity of the social relations. The transformation of a capitalist into a socialist nation is possible only under the leadership of the working class with its clear political, ideological and theoretical orientation. Yet most of the socialist-oriented countries are headed not by the main classes of either capitalist or socialist society, but by the so-called revolutionary-democratic strata, whose ideology and policy are, by reason of their petty-bourgeois essence, eclectic and inconsistent. All the same, revolutionary democrats are usually sincere in striving for truly free national development, though the necessary social, economic, ideological and political preconditions are often still lacking. The properties of the transition-type nation are still only shaping, and it is premature to define them in any specific form. Such nations are usually

led by the revolutionary-democratic sections, while the activity of the national bourgeoisie and its chances to seize the leading role are visibly limited. The economic basis consists chiefly of the state sector and the burgeoning cooperatives. The ideological basis is anti-imperialistic, strongly influenced by nationalism and an interlacement of democratic elements with different doctrines of utopian socialism, expressive of the continuously growing influence of scientific socialism. As we have said, the national state is the main instrument in forming the transition-type nations. Its official ideology also predetermines the fabric of the national consciousness.

The development of the newly independent socialist-oriented peoples shows that patriotism rather than nationalism is a principal political and ideological element of national consolidation.

Efforts to achieve national unity — no matter that this term is purely conventional for countries where nations have not yet fully formed — are extremely important for the victory of national-democratic revolutions, because they assure the unity of the internal forces able to participate in the revolution. In the first stage of the national liberation movement, when liberation from foreign rule is still the chief objective, unity is forged mainly on the basis of nationalism, and primarily of its democratic elements. At this stage, the reactionary essence of nationalism is less felt than its democratic elements, and precisely these are able to unite what are in substance socially heterogeneous forces in the drive for political liberation.

The situation changes in the second stage of the national liberation movement, when the task of consolidating the gains through deep-going social, economic and political reconstruction takes precedence. Now, progress is possible only if the reactionary forces are either totally removed from power or, at the very least, their capability to retard progress is restricted. It is the logic of the struggle that at this point the foes of the socialist orientation will try to use nationalism, in which under their influence its reactionary elements begin to supercede the democratic.

The changes in the content of nationalism are at first barely perceptible, and the revolutionary-democratic strata continue

to use it (chiefly, of course, they use the democratic elements in its content). Experience shows, however, that unity based on nationalism alone—even if mainly the democratic elements in its content are meant thereby—becomes increasingly unreliable and, in the final count, simply impossible. This is why, as the non-capitalist way takes firmer hold the national-democratic parties move away from nationalism and unite the country's sound forces on a patriotic basis.

Why is nationalism, which had, by virtue of its democratic elements, played a definitely positive role in the struggle for political freedom, no longer able to unite the progressive forces in the conditions of the socialist orientation?

To begin with, the tendency towards exclusiveness, isolation and narrowness, implicit in the substance of any type of nationalism, usually manifests itself in the developing countries in a setting of ethnic diversity. Tribalism, which becomes stronger on this basis, is often used by groups fighting for power, or by outside enemies. Another negative effect of reactionary nationalism is that in combating the remnants of colonialism or neocolonialism, the developing country shies from cooperating with the progressive forces of countries in whose name the colonialists had acted or continue to act, and tries to root out the positive influences these progressive forces have exercised on the life of the formerly oppressed people. Furthermore, the national exclusiveness cultivated by home reaction does tremendous harm, because it tends to isolate the newly liberated people from the world's progressive forces, and especially from the socialist countries. The reactionary content of nationalism is fertile soil for nationalist feelings to the detriment of class consciousness, and thus also for anti-communism, undermining the natural alliance of the national-democratic revolution with the international working-class and communist movement, with the world socialist system.

Consequently, the socialist orientation implies a new conception of national unity, materialising in the struggle against the narrow nationalist platforms of the reactionary forces and, more important still, in the reconstruction of the old or the formation of a new patriotic front of all progressive forces.

Due to the undeveloped social structure, the often unstable correlation of class forces, and the ceaseless intrigues of international imperialism, such a front is essential in order to mobilise the progressive forces and accomplish the national-democratic revolution, promote the processes of national consolidation, and assure the formation of the transition-type nation.

Patriotism as the platform of national unity presents a number of important advantages for the progressive forces. Not only does it assure unity in a single front, but also stimulates the progressive forces capable of rising above conflicts between and within nations, above inter-tribal strife, for the sake of the country's progress. No less important is the fact that true patriotism makes it possible to rely on the external sources of progress, first and foremost on the alliance with world socialism. All this contributes to national consolidation and accelerates the formation of the transition-type nation.

Nations of the transitional type are a relatively short-lived phenomenon, which, however, may cover a period of several decades until the socialist orientation triumphs in the country, a dependable economic base in the form of state property is created as a precondition for the passage to socialism, and a national working class emerges and consolidates itself on this basis. This is when the ways and forms of the gradual transformation of transition-type nations into socialist nations will finally become clear. But a reverse order of things is also possible: as long as the forces of socialism and capitalism are locked in struggle, the national bourgeoisie may jointly with other reactionary forces and with the support of foreign imperialism succeed in arresting the country's progressive development. Then, the burgeoning nation will follow the capitalist way and become a capitalist nation.

The non-capitalist way assures greater influence of the process of internationalisation, which has spread to all spheres of life in the world. Already, the developing countries are involved in it. For many years, US reactionaries tried to throttle heroic Cuba with the help of the Latin American peoples, but could not, for all their efforts, breach the wall of the working people's solidarity. The consolidation of Peru's progressives

has given added strength to this solidarity, and marks a new advance of the revolution in Latin America.

The peoples of Africa are tightening their unity despite counter-efforts by the monopoly magnates. Though the conditions in which the national and inter-national processes in Africa occur are extremely difficult, the imperialists have not been able to turn the continent into a field of strife and conflict. The colonialists and their menials did manage to provoke civil wars, but only in a few countries — Zaire, Nigeria, and a few others. Most of the conflicts and border clashes were settled. This goes to the credit of the Organisation of African Unity, formed in the teeth of colonialist resistance, which is doing good work despite imperialist subversion. The OAU Committee for aiding the national liberation struggle of the peoples of the South African Republic, Zimbabwe and Namibia is redoubling its efforts.

"The way to carry out the tasks of national development and social progress and effectively rebuff neocolonialist intrigues," observed the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, "is to raise the activity of the people, enhance the role of the proletariat and the peasants, rally working youth, students, intellectuals, urban middle strata and democratic army circles — all patriotic and progressive forces. It is this kind of unity the Communist and Workers' Parties are calling for."¹

Those are the deep-going changes in the national liberation movement of today and in the life of people in the developing countries, who are learning from their own experience that world socialism is a true friend and dependable ally of all fighters for national and social emancipation. The steadily growing strength of the world socialist system is the earnest of the free and independent development of all young national states, of the success of the national liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 29.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

THE IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE OVER THE NATIONAL QUESTION

1. TWO OPPOSITE APPROACHES TO THE NATIONAL QUESTION

The nature of the struggle of the two ideologies over the national question requires a concrete analysis and an examination of the changing correlation of the two opposite class forces—those of socialism and capitalism.

With socialist society establishing itself in a vast part of the globe and with proletarian internationalism becoming the state ideology and policy of the socialist countries, the conditions and the character of the ideological struggle between the two systems are changing radically.

The very practice of building the community of free peoples contributes decisively to the struggle of the socialist ideology against the bourgeois. The new type of relations between the USSR and other socialist countries, based on the truly humane relationship between peoples of different races and nationalities, devoid of hostility and mistrust, undermines the imperialist system of oppression and enslavement, revolutionises the labouring masses, and gives them confidence in the triumph of socialism and communism.

The friendship and cooperation of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries with countries of the non-capitalist orientation, countries fighting against imperialism and colonialism, are making a tremendous ideological impact.

The political actions of the socialist states against imperialism and its policy of aggression and neocolonialism, their selfless support of patriots fighting against imperialist aggression, for freedom and the right to decide their own future, give added strength to the revolutionary forces and bring them together in the common anti-imperialist struggle.

This adds to the importance of the ideological activity of the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties, promoting the development and spread of Marxist-Leninist theory and combating views and postures hostile to socialism, including the national question. It is not surprising that a sharp clash of ideas has occurred precisely over the national relations of free peoples and the mutual relations of states, especially those building socialism and those fighting against imperialism. This is one of the focal points in the contradictions between socialism and capitalism. The resolution of the CPSU Central Committee on the preparations for the 50th Anniversary of the USSR pointed out that "the national question is a vital feature of the struggle between socialism and capitalism, and of Marxism-Leninism against bourgeois and revisionist ideology. The imperialists resort extensively to fomenting racialism, and try to disunite the various sections of the working people on national grounds in the hope of weakening the positions of socialism, and splitting the ranks of the international communist and working-class movement, and of suppressing the national liberation movement."¹

In the fight against hostile ideology, Lenin taught us, Communists should never go on the defensive. It is their duty, stemming from the very nature of the Marxist-Leninist ideology, to retain the initiative at all times, to defeat all attempts at minimising the antithesis of the standpoints of the contending sides. The struggle of the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties against anti-communism, against various bourgeois and revisionist conceptions, against nationalism and for the purity of Marxist-Leninist principles and proletarian internationalism, is fully in keeping with this guideline, is active and of an offensive nature.

Drawing on the experience of socialist and communist construction, the Marxists-Leninists are creatively advancing the teaching of proletarian internationalism, and are proving the vitality and relevance of the ideas of scientific communism. Deep studies sharpen the ideological weapon of the Communist Party and help overcome anti-Leninist views and theories.

¹ *On Preparations for the 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*. Resolution of the CC CPSU, p. 15.

Here are some of the topics subjected to continuous scrutiny in the light of new developments: the international character of Leninism, the principles of socialist integration, the forms and methods of the international solidarity of the peoples and detachments of the working class, defence of socialism as the prime international duty, the essence of nationalism and its manifestations, the correlation of the international and the national in the socialist environment, the class approach to national problems and the ways and means of resolving the national question. There is intensive theoretical activity within each Marxist-Leninist party, and broad joint study of vital problems at international meetings and conferences. Thanks to this, the norms and principles of proletarian internationalism, enriched by collective creative experience constitute the common platform of the entire world communist movement. This adds still more to their significance, makes them still more effective.

Coming to grips with anti-communist and bourgeois conceptions — on the national question — Communists show the class essence of bourgeois nationalist theories, show their theoretical fallacy, their hostility to the interests of the popular masses.

Profound and convincing criticism of imperialism as a system of social coercion and national enslavement is highly important. Exposure of capitalism's anti-people's essence helps show the striking contrast between the peaceful and freedom-loving declarations of the imperialists and their ideologues, and the true nature of imperialist policy. Exposure of the theories of capitalism's advocates, of the chasm between the democratic rhetoric and inhuman substance of imperialist policy are the main trends in the ideological offensive of Marxists-Leninists. No matter how hard bourgeois ideologists may try, they will never be able to conceal the fact that imperialism:

- is the source of aggressive wars, the enemy of international cooperation;
- is for the peoples the carrier of hunger, poverty, colonialism, racial and national discrimination;
- is trying to rob the peoples of hard-won freedom and independence and bind them in the chains of colonialism;
- is impinging on the national interests of peoples;

— is consigning the peoples to a bleak existence devoid of lofty ideals.

Which of these theoretical views of bourgeois ideologists on the national question are the target of the Marxist-Leninist parties' ideological work? Before answering this question, we must make a concrete analysis of present-day anti-communism and the forms of its reactionary activity in connection with the national question. In no other area is it more apparent than in the national question that modern capitalism is incapable of producing salient convincing ideas which could seize the masses, that its ideological resources amount to either obviously reactionary anti-people's theories, or speculation on the past ideals and slogans which the bourgeoisie has long since betrayed.

This, like the other modern anti-communist conceptions, is clear evidence of the profound crisis of imperialist ideology.

Whatever frantic efforts anti-communist ideologists may make, they are unable to conceal the weakness of their ideological positions, the futility of their attempts to disprove the Marxist-Leninist teaching, which is confirmed by accomplished facts, by the reality of a new world.

When the Soviet Union celebrated its 50th anniversary, bourgeois ideologists asked themselves how to respond to the challenge of socialism, which had succeeded in resolving one of the most difficult problems society has ever had to cope with, a problem that defeated all the touted bourgeois democracies.

The outcome of the century-old contention between proletarian internationalism and bourgeois nationalism is a foregone conclusion. The changes in the destiny of the peoples bespeak the vitality and ultimate triumph of the Marxist-Leninist ideology of proletarian internationalism. But it will do us no good to simplify the matter, to minimise the harm of hostile actions, especially in the period when the new type of relations between peoples is still only emerging.

It is precisely the nationalistic tendencies, especially those which assume the form of anti-Sovietism, that bourgeois ideologists and bourgeois propaganda place most reliance on in their fight against socialism and the communist movement.

In addition to the bourgeois ideologists, exponents of right and "left" revisionism, too, oppose Marxism-Leninism and

proletarian internationalism. Despite the great variety of conceptions and the dissimilarity of starting points, all of them share the one aim of emasculating the revolutionary essence of the internationalist principles and replacing them with bourgeois-nationalist notions, splitting the forces of world socialism and the communist movement.

A close examination of national processes in any part of the world will show that both the objective growth and the artificial inflation of the national factor are accompanied by increasingly significant social processes that undermine the capitalist system and strengthen the forces of socialism and national liberation. Understanding the interconnections between national and social processes makes it possible accurately to anticipate the further course of history. It is in vain that the imperialists hope nationalism will dam up the advance of the peoples to socialism and communism.

The working masses have acquired a deeper social and class insight. They are more conscious of the need to blend their increasing patriotism with solidarity with all peoples fighting against imperialism. Proletarian internationalism has been, and will always be, the banner of the working people of different nations in the fight for common class interests, for liberation, for socialism and communism.

The ideologues of imperialism reject out of hand the class approach to the national question and the idea that international conflicts stem from the antagonistic nature of bourgeois society. They regard nationalism as the motive force of human society.

The views of bourgeois ideologists concerning international relations were influenced for years by the fact that until the present epoch a group of great powers had dominated the world, while all the other countries and peoples were in varying degrees an object of their policy. Imperialism's might and power gave it the "right" to tailor and retaylor the map of the world as it saw fit, to start wasteful wars, to enslave and plunder other peoples. This is why relations between states or peoples were portrayed by bourgeois ideologists as a sphere of arbitrary action by the great powers, which held the reins of authority all over the world.

The evolution of the bourgeois concepts of the national

question in the sphere of international relations reflects to a certain extent the general evolution of bourgeois ideology, which has become more reactionary and more strongly tinged with anti-communism. Bourgeois ideologists cannot, of course, ignore the enormous changes in the world, and are compelled to try and adapt their concepts to the new situation. They are modernising their views, and resorting to more and more refined methods of struggle against the ideas of socialism and the friendship of the peoples.

The fact that the United States has become the citadel of the "Western World" and that the role of the US monopolies has increased to colossal proportions, has a strong bearing on the evolution of bourgeois views.

Anti-communism has become imperialism's main political and ideological weapon against world socialism, against the revolutionary movement. And it is continuously reinforced by modernised chauvinist, cosmopolitan and nationalist conceptions.

It is an amusing fact that in promoting "Western community" the "national idea" is usually played down and described as a "harmful aftermath" of past history. Imperialist ideologues attack nationalism that is directly or indirectly aimed against the supremacy of US monopolies in other countries, but reverse their posture in the case of manifestations of nationalism in any of the European socialist states. Here, imperialists portray nationalism as a synonym of "struggle for freedom", to which they attach their waning hope of returning the socialist countries to the capitalist fold. Such "pluralism" is evidence not simply of the eclectic nature of the bourgeois theory on the national question, but also of an extreme, class-motivated subjectivism, and of a lack of scruples in the choice of weapons.

Bourgeois ideology is unequivocal in its anti-communist orientation. Which naturally also applies to its views on the national question.

By exaggerating the contradictions that inevitably accompany the evolution of new relations between nations and the conquest of freedom and equal rights, bourgeois ideologists try to salvage the basis of their views on the national question—the notion that national factors are incompatible with

the principle of internationalism, that national relations are always a sphere of hostile motivations and the result of a clash of factors of a natural or subjective order. In so doing, they gloss over the essential difference between national relations under socialism and capitalism. For this reason they deny the antithesis of the socialist and bourgeois types of integration, and obscure the fundamental difference between the nationalism of the oppressor nation and that of oppressed nations.

There is a big variety of bourgeois trends of thought on the national question. But no matter how varied they are, it is easy to spot the old trends on which the policy of the exploiting classes has been based for so long, and to distinguish the latest conceptions.

Exponents of the *racist* trend proceed from the notion of biological inequality, maintaining that racial and national oppression is conditioned by nature, which created "superior" and "inferior" races. This is probably the most reactionary of all the conceptions of national relations. Precisely due to its misanthropic substance it was used by the fascists as the "theoretical" basis for their policy of extermination and enslavement.

Though the general influence of racism as an ideology has declined visibly since the debacle of fascism, its followers in South Africa, the United States and other capitalist countries, are trying desperately to extend the life of various racist notions, and first of all of the idea that racial and national conflicts are irremediable, that antagonism is inevitable in relations between nations. Typically, they portray the unprecedented movement of the Black people for their rights as an "ineluctable" explosion of "natural" feelings of hostility towards other nations. The same argument is used to preserve the system of racial segregation and apartheid.

True, there are now fewer advocates of racist experiments *à la* Hitler. But the idea that the civilisations allegedly created by the white, yellow, and negroid races are basically different, that invisible psychological barriers separate the peoples from each other, is still expounded in different ways. In the immediate postwar period bourgeois conceptions about the "national character" were widespread. There even appeared special

schools of ethnopsychologists in the United States, Britain and other Western countries, who set out in a big way to investigate alleged psychological flaws (or virtues) of nations. These fancied qualities established mainly by psychoanalysing individuals of different nations were to predetermine the place of the peoples concerned in the political hierarchy of the bourgeois world. Taking advantage of the fact that the problem of the national character has not been properly studied, bourgeois scholars frequently depict the chauvinist prejudices and stereotypes widespread in the capitalist world as actual properties of peoples. What this amounts to is a disguised revival of racist notions, which are always centred on proving the psychic inferiority of peoples that become the object of imperialist expansion.

Alongside a revival of traditional forms of covert and overt racism, forms of "anti-white" racism have appeared in recent times. Certain non-white nationalist and chauvinist ideologists are trying to inject racist factors into the struggle of peoples of non-white races against imperialist oppression and for national liberation. This distorts the legitimate growth of the national consciousness and is meant to substitute spurious or exaggerated national contradictions for the real social contradictions.

Whatever its form, racism is an ideology of the reactionary social forces hostile to the basic interests of all peoples. The most typical example of the unity of racism and chauvinism is Zionism—weapon of world reaction, shock force of anti-communism, enemy of the national liberation movement of the Arab people, and foe of working Jews all over the world.

Chauvinism is one of the most prominent trends in bourgeois ideology. The conception of national exclusiveness and superiority, coupled with contempt for other nations, which is implicit in chauvinism, makes it the ideological foundation of extreme reactionary imperialist policies.

The attempts at reviving chauvinism and revanchism in West Germany should on no account escape our field of vision. Their promoters are naturally aware that ideas of the "great millennium" and "the Aryan mission" will no longer cut any ice. As a rule, they clothe their aggressive and annexationist ambitions in the cosmopolitan garb of a "united Europe" guarding "Western civilisation" against the fancied "threat" of

communist aggression. The more extreme reactionary groups, which had dreamed of returning to Germany's 1937 borders by force and propagated the idea of "living space", have been defeated by the conclusion of the USSR-FRG, Polish-FRG and Czechoslovak-FRG treaties. But the "German national mission" ideology is still alive among imperialist groups. In combination with worship of force and praise for the economic uplift in the FRG, this produced demands for "a sound national consciousness" — which is no more than a screen for the old ambitions, the dream of a new role for bourgeois Germany as the main force in Europe.

Wolfgang Heise, a German scholar, writes that "chauvinism, this imperialist manipulation and exaggeration of the true feeling of national dependence, acts as an ideological connection convenient for maintaining dominance. It is a form of state consciousness ready for sacrifices, whereas anti-communism seems to be only a negative, and cosmopolitanism an overly intellectual, ideology".¹

In a way, the evolution of the US imperialist ideology resembles the ideological substantiation of the ambitions of the West German monopolies. It was the USA where the cosmopolitan concept of an Atlantic community originated, developing into the main instrument of US expansion in the early 1960s. But by the mid-1960s its weaknesses came to the surface when it encountered strong resistance even among members of the Western bloc. As a result, the more aggressive and militarist elements have reverted to chauvinism and advocate speciously construed national values in place of the abstract idea of "supranationality".

The makers of US imperialism's foreign policy pleaded and still plead US "national interests" and a special mission in Asia to vindicate aggression in Indochina. They portrayed as national interests their own expansionist and anti-communist ambitions, in which the vast majority of the nation has no real stake. As for the US "mission" in Southeast Asia, it was and is opposed abroad and at home by the progressive public.

¹ Wolfgang Heise, *Aufbruch in die Illusion. Zur Kritik der bürgerlichen Philosophie in Deutschland*. Berlin, 1964. (Appeared in Russian translation in 1968, Moscow, Progress Publishers.) The passage is on p. 429 of the Russian language edition.

The interest of the ruling groups driving for expansion and refusing to curb their appetite, rather than the real welfare of the nation, lies at the base of the bourgeois concept of "national interests". James P. Speer, a US professor, who scrutinises one such concept, draws attention to the fact that in this context "the national interest can have no intellectual or rational content, it is indeed essentially meaningless and mindless, for it is the expression at the international level of the lust for power".¹

Imperialism's ingrained violence in home politics, as well as in international relations, gives rise to ideologies saturated with contempt for the interests of other peoples, extolling abuses in foreign policy and strong-willed action by "strong-willed personalities".

Bourgeois ideologists portray the chauvinist ambitions of the ruling class as patriotism, hoping thereby to enlist the support of the people in capitalist countries. Yet chauvinism, a monstrous distortion of national feelings, and the patriotism of the masses, have nothing in common.

The frequent references to "national prestige" and the "country's honour" by bourgeois advocates of imperialist policy are sacrilege coming from them, if only because they build "prestige" and uphold "honour" by trampling on the elementary rights of other peoples.

In his article, *On the National Pride of the Great Russians*, Lenin contrasted the principle of equality in relations between peoples to the feudal principle of privileges, which are demeaning for a great nation. He angrily denounced autocracy, which demoralised, as well as oppressed, the population, encouraging oppression of other peoples and concealing its own shame behind hypocritical, speciously patriotic rhetoric.² True national pride has nothing in common with national arrogance and praise of a country just because it is yours. True national pride is based on a faithful assessment of your nation's contribution to the world-wide struggle for freedom and progress, on unconditional acceptance of the equality

¹ James P. Speer II, "Hans Morgenthau and the World State", *World Politics*, Vol. XX, January 1968, No. 2, p. 218.

² See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 104.

of all nations, and on a class evaluation of your country's policy.

When the US Communists and progressives joined all upright people in the rest of the world to denounce the criminal US imperialist adventure in Indochina, they did so out of reverence for the great democratic traditions of their nation and abhorrence of anything that disgraces the United States: the policy of aggression and racialism, anti-communism and militarism.

Reactionary US propaganda brands this condemnation of chauvinist policy as betrayal of "Americanism". But there are more and more people in the United States who recognise anti-war activity as activity for the country's radiant future, and not as betrayal.

"True patriotism," the US Marxists Betty Gannett and V. J. Jerome wrote, "is not always manifested in expressions of pride in the role of one's country. There come moments in the life of a nation when the true patriot is filled with shame."¹ Exposure by the US Communists of the chauvinist hate propaganda against the Vietnamese people, their mass appeals to take action against the imperialist policy are acts in keeping with their national and international duty, and the proof of their fidelity to the democratic traditions of Jefferson, Paine, Lincoln and Whitman.

Chauvinism builds on the idea that hostility, conflicts, suspicion, and the strong nation's will to rule the weak are ingrained attributes of relations between peoples. It places spurious "national interests" above the call of reason and justice.

The other form of imperialism's expansionist ideas, as noted earlier, is *cosmopolitanism*. Its exponents hold that national factors have become an anachronism. National movements, as they see it, are retrogressive. They proclaim "world citizenship" and "world government" the supreme ideal that would end all national conflicts. These people (Arnold Toynbee, Hans Morgenthau, John Stoessinger, and others) declare against nationalism, advocate cosmopolitanism and national

¹ Betty Gannett and V. J. Jerome, "On Patriotism and National Pride", *Political Affairs*, October 1954, p. 33.

nihilism, but are, in effect, promoting the chauvinist interests of their country's monopoly capital.

In recent years, a trend which urges incitement of nationalism in the socialist world has gained considerable currency. It is unmistakably linked with imperialist policy and candid anticommunism (Zbigniew Brzezinski, Richard Pipes, John C. Campbell, Boris Meissner, Karl Mehnert, and others).

Capitalising on various nationalist manifestations in different regions of the world, imperialist ideologists spread the idea of the "omnipotent" virus of nationalism, which is said to afflict all countries irrespective of their social system. They deliberately create a mystique, claiming that national hostility has its origin in human nature.

Part One of Bertram D. Wolfe's *Marxism. One Hundred Years in the Life of a Doctrine* is entitled, "Nationalism or Internationalism". An inveterate antagonist of Marxism, the writer maintains that the doctrine of proletarian internationalism advanced by Marx and Engels and elaborated on by Lenin, underestimates the complexity of the national problems and is too hasty in "writing off" nationalism.

Marx and Engels, he would have us believe, were overrational. They discovered the socio-economic implications of nationalism, but underrated its impulsive force. Hence, to quote Wolfe, the erroneous Marxist forecast of history. The Marxists, he claims, assumed that the demolition of the existing social system would automatically eliminate national conflicts and nationalism. Yet, he argues, the nature of nations is unalterable. Under socialism, too, the bourgeois historian says, man is moved by the same blind feelings of hostility and hate towards members of other countries and nations as have coloured the entire history of mankind. "By seeking the roots of national antagonisms mainly in the class structure of human society," wrote Kolarz, a confederate of Wolfe's, "the communists neglect the importance of the psychological and moral factors which are so decisive in creating national animosities, and especially those irrational feelings of national and racial hatred which are part of the evil in man".¹ Note the reference

¹ W. Kolarz, *Communism and Colonialism*, London 1964, p. 137.

to the "evil in man", an entirely spurious notion, on which reactionary ideologists pin their hopes.

No, Marxist-Leninist science does not deny that moral and psychological motives play a part in the life of society. But it provides them with a social explanation, whereas bourgeois ideologists refer to some mysterious and incurable evil, an innate animosity which, allegedly, prevents people of different nations from living in peace and friendship. Such irrational feelings, they contend, are the cause of the everlasting wish of every nation to regard itself the centre of the universe and treat other nations with contempt and hostility. This sort of thing, known as ethnocentrism, reflects the existing elements of imperialist-induced national exclusiveness and animosity around which bourgeois sociologists try to create an aura of mystique.

A widespread bourgeois concept of national relations is that as long as members of a nation live apart from others, their "animosity" manifests itself chiefly outside the nation. As intercourse between nations increases—and that is one of the salient features of the modern world—members of different races and nations come into more frequent contact. This, bourgeois sociologists aver, sharpens feelings of ethnocentrism. The fact that social processes are becoming increasingly internationalised leads them to conclude that the more intensive contacts between different nations will multiply racial and national conflicts.

In short, if we are to believe bourgeois sociology, the prospects for humanity are nothing if not gloomy.

Saturated with the pessimism typical of the ideologists of the moribund classes, this outlook nullifies the progress already made towards international relations of a new type in the class struggle and in the creative activity of the masses, and the immense influence of such relations on different peoples, on individuals and their morality and habits as social beings.

The experience of the Soviet Union, which has brought together different nations and nationalities living in friendship and brotherhood, shows, however, that the real prospects are worlds removed from animosity and oversensitive national feelings. On the contrary, there will be closer and closer friendship, closer and closer brotherhood. This is borne out by

the relations among the peoples of the socialist community, and by the relations between the socialist countries and the national liberation movement.

Imperialism gives rise to social and national conflicts. But there is nothing "preordained" about them.

Reactionary ideologists are eager to obscure the qualitative difference between the various manifestations of national consciousness. They separate the national question from the social structure. For them national relations are an independent process not subject to or governed by any objective laws. For them the civil rights struggle of the Black people in the United States and the beastly behaviour of the racials come under the one abstract head of racial conflict, the product or result of an outbreak of incognisable and irrational feelings.

That is the methodological foundation of the bourgeois approach to the national question. It permits its exponents to apply the same yardstick to the capitalist society racked by antagonisms, and the fundamentally different type of relations under socialism. By so doing they ascribe to the socialist world the evils implicit in capitalism, and use this maliciously as yet another argument "disproving" Marxism-Leninism.

The purpose of the bourgeois ideologists is to prove that strife and conflict between nations is either irremediable or may be overcome exclusively in the framework of a supranational organisation distinct from socialism. They want to show that antagonisms will disappear not as a result of changes in production relations, but of the scientific and technological revolution, which, they allege, leads to a "single industrial society". On the pretext of overcoming national self-interest, they in fact advocate denial of legitimate national rights and vindicate the cosmopolitan aspirations of international monopoly.

But all attempts to oppose socialism and proletarian internationalism to some other "international model" are groundless.

Bourgeois nationalism is the product of the exploiting system. It is powered by the class antagonisms of capitalist society. Once these antagonisms are abolished, national antagonisms, too, gradually disappear. Despite anti-Marxist claims, history has not invalidated this thesis of the *Communist*

Manifesto. What it has fully and conclusively invalidated, however, are the notions of the vulgarisers of Marxism, who claim that the socialist revolution automatically resolves all national problems. The building of the new society has shown that internationalism and truly humane relations between peoples take root in unswerving opposition to bourgeois nationalism and all its different manifestations.

No matter how contradictory the growth of the class and internationalist consciousness may be, it is this growth and not nationalist see-sawing that typifies the worldwide working-class movement of today. This is borne out by the steady expansion of fraternal cooperation among the socialist countries, by their success in all areas of society. Fidelity to the common interests of working people is demonstrated in the mammoth class battles of the workers in capitalist countries. The power of proletarian internationalism is displayed by the solidarity and growing unity of Communist and Workers' Parties, and by the massive movements of working people crossing all national frontiers against imperialist aggression, colonialism and racism, and in defence of world peace and security.

2. THE INCONQUERABLE FORCE OF PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM AND THE BANKRUPTCY OF ITS CRITICS

No longer, as a rule, do the imperialists assault socialism head-on. They prefer to try and explode the socialist community from within, to weaken its unity by encouraging revisionist and nationalist elements. Whenever they get a chance they capitalise on difficulties in the world communist movement and attack proletarian internationalism. The more intense ideological struggle of the two systems, first of all the struggle between proletarian internationalism and bourgeois nationalism, is therefore a characteristic feature of the times.

Inciting nationalism, bourgeois propaganda aims at persuading the peoples of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries that socialism and internationalist solidarity are contrary to their "national interests"; at neutralising the tremendous appeal of socialist and communist construction among the peoples of the developing countries and diverting them from their fraternal alliance with the world socialist system; at dampening the revolutionary élan of the proletariat

in the Western countries and paralysing its drive for peace, democracy and socialism. Anti-communist propaganda was visibly more strident during the celebrations of the 50th anniversary of the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, concentrating its efforts on disrupting friendship and fraternal cooperation among the peoples of the USSR and other socialist countries. False interpretation of the development of nations and national relations has, in fact, become the focus of present-day anti-communism.

The main anti-communist angles of attack in the national question are the following.

First, the theoretical foundations of the Leninist national policy is perverted by falsifying the CPSU programme on the national question and distorting the truth about the Bolshevik position before the October Revolution and in the later period. The main accent is on attributing indifference to national problems, and minimising Lenin's role as champion of the rights of nations and as fighter for national liberation. History is distorted and the significance of the formation of the USSR misrepresented. Rewriting history to suit their ends, bourgeois ideologists focus attention on various nationalist movements. Against this background the formation of the USSR is portrayed as contrary to the aspirations of the peoples.

Second, reactionary ideologues deny the fact that the national question in the USSR has been resolved, and try to cast doubt on Soviet federalism and deliberately counterpose the national to the federal interests of the peoples. Instead of examining the experience of the USSR as the world's first state union of genuinely free peoples, they indulge in speculative discussions. One of the questions they ask, for example, is whether the states of the USA or the Soviet republics have more independence. In so doing they ignore the fact that the structure of the USA is not determined by the national background of the population and does not secure the rights of the Black, Puerto Rican and other peoples and national minorities, and that for this very reason any reference to it as a model for solving the national question is unwarranted.

Third, anti-communists negate the fundamentally new type of national relations under socialism resulting from consistent observance of Lenin's principles of internationalism, and try

and prove that antagonisms, chauvinism and nationalism are equally implicit in socialism as they are in capitalism.

Fourth, they identify the policy of the convergence of nations with Russification, identify the policy of the Communist Party with the colonialist policy of Russia's tsarist government.

Fifth, bourgeois ideologues portray the Communist Party's efforts to stamp out nationalist prejudices as a policy of eradicating all national features.

Sixth, they distort the principles of Soviet foreign policy, impute hegemonism and great-power chauvinism to the Soviet Union's relations with other countries.

Neither Marx nor Lenin, bourgeois ideologists claim, had ever specially dealt with the national question, and had treated it as only of secondary significance. All that Lenin was interested in, writes Alfred D. Low in his book, *Lenin and the National Question*, was class struggle and capture of power by the proletariat. This is meant to portray Lenin as an out-and-out pragmatist for whom the national factor was only of instrumental value.

In September 1966, at the 6th World Congress of Sociologists in Evian, the Soviet delegates learned of yet another concept of the same type, advanced by the American Professor Dadrian. He maintained that Lenin underestimated the national feelings of the peoples and the right of nations to self-determination. And to give his absurd thesis more credibility, he did not hesitate to pervert Lenin's national question principles.

Here is an example. Presenting the Marxist approach to the national question, Lenin wrote: "Marx had no doubt as to the subordinate position of the national question as compared with the 'labour question'."¹ Taking this phrase out of context, Dadrian claimed that his thesis was therefore "self-evident". Yet the sense and purpose of Lenin's thought is clarified in the next sentence, which Dadrian omitted: "But his theory is as far from ignoring national movements as heaven is from earth."²

Certainly, for Marxism-Leninism the national question is not

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 436.

² *Ibid.*

self-contained. The national and the social are interconnected. The national question cannot be solved until capitalism is overthrown and the proletarian dictatorship is established. That is the social basis on which the question was resolved in the Soviet country. Lenin's many works on the national question and his activity before and after the October Revolution clearly show that all his energy and devotion were centred on achieving the social and national emancipation of all the peoples of Russia.

Lenin was the moving spirit behind such historic documents as the Declaration of Rights of the Peoples of Russia and the Declaration of Rights of the Working and Exploited People, which ushered in a new era in the mutual relations of the peoples.

In the period after the October Revolution, Lenin showed deep concern for the interests of all the nations and national minorities in Soviet Russia. He displayed the utmost tact, a profound understanding of the mass psychology, essential in matters of national relations. At the same time he waged irreconcilable struggle against nationalism and chauvinism.

The activity of the Communist Party speaks of its deep fidelity to Lenin's principles: it is profoundly considerate in its approach to national problems, shows constant concern for the interests of all nations, for their unity and friendship, and acts promptly and firmly against haste, fiat and abuse in the realm of national relations. Now, too, Lenin's principles are an inviolable law for the USSR. This is borne out by the Programme of the CPSU and the resolutions of the 24th and 25th CPSU Congresses.

The Central Committee Report to the 24th Congress says that the drawing together of nations in the Soviet Union "is taking place under conditions in which the closest attention is given to national features and the development of socialist national cultures. Constant consideration for the general interests of our entire Union and for the interests of each of its constituent republics forms the substance of the Party's policy in this question.

"The Party shall continue to strengthen the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics...."¹

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 92.

The CPSU is working for the full flowering of the nations and their steady convergence in the course of communist construction.

While acknowledging the flowering of the nations in the USSR, bourgeois sociologists deny the objective nature of their convergence. They interpret it as a purely artificial policy of the CPSU, designed to power a process that allegedly lacks root in reality. Thereby they try to oppose the convergence of nations to their development.

The further convergence of nations is a basic question of communist construction. By fortifying the unity and cohesion of the nations, the Party unites the efforts of the peoples for effective building of communism. In the socialist environment the objective process of the drawing together of nations is consonant with the policy of the Communist Party.

What the bourgeois ideologists are trying to do, therefore, is to discredit the Party's policy by perverting the substance of the convergence of nations. They look for aspects in the objective reality whereby to distort the nature of the Communist Party's national policy. Among other things, they exploit the question of national languages in the setting of communist construction, and the role of the Russian language as the language of communication between nations. Their purpose is clear, because alongside their native language, all peoples of the USSR display a growing thirst for learning Russian, which greatly stimulates the drawing together of nations and the mutual exchange of cultural values.

Bourgeois sociologists seized on the fact that in the 1970 Census 13 million non-Russians put down Russian as their native language. For them this was evidence of a denationalisation and forcible Russification of the peoples of the socialist republics. This malicious interpretation was meant to incite strife and animosity among the peoples of the USSR.

In reality, however, about half of these 13 million are Ukrainians and Byelorussians residing mainly outside their republics, and some Moldavians, Armenians, Jews, etc., residing outside their national-state territories.

In other words, a section of the non-Russian population living in the midst of the Russian or other populations has in a perfectly natural way adopted Russian as its native language.

This does not mean that these persons have lost all trace of their national identity or consciousness.

To fill out the picture, let us turn to other figures relating to the national composition of the population and its attitude to language. In the 1970 Census, for example, 85.7 per cent of the Ukrainians and 80.6 per cent of the Byelorussians put down Ukrainian and Byelorussian respectively as their native language. But this does not prevent either the Ukrainians or the Byelorussians (or other nations of the USSR) from learning and using Russian—the language of a fraternal people that have played an outstanding part in the country's revolutionary transformation.

The vastly progressive significance of these processes is incontestable. Yet we must also remember that in the case of peoples which had been brutally oppressed by the tsarist system in the past, the number of persons who put down their national language as their mother tongue, is still continuing to grow. Take the Bashkirs. In 1926 54 per cent put down their national language as their mother tongue, in 1939 the percentage rose to 58, in 1959 to 62, and in 1970 to 66.2. This is clear evidence of a natural gravitation towards the national language. In the 1939 Census, the Uzbek language was named as native by 97.8 per cent of the Uzbeks, in 1959 by 98.4 per cent, and in 1970 by 98.6 per cent. The same is true of the Azerbaijanians, Abkhazians, Karakalpaks and members of other nationalities. Furthermore, there is a considerable number of non-nationals for whom the language of the basic nationality in the republic in which they reside has become native. Among these are Russians and others. In the Ukraine, for example, persons of non-Ukrainian origin who adopted Ukrainian as their native language in 1959 totalled 490,000. In Byelorussia, their number was 276,000, Uzbekistan 74,000 and Latvia 28,500.¹

The fact that the wish to learn Russian is strong, and is sure to become still stronger, does not speak of any coercion in linguistic relations. On the contrary, as Lenin had predicted, it is growing stronger due to the profound democratism of the

¹ See A. A. Isupov, *National Composition of the Population of the USSR. Results of the 1959 Census*, Moscow, 1964, p. 36 (in Russian).

socialist system and is spurred by the needs of society's development, especially economic development. The significance of Russian in the Soviet Union does not derive from the fact that part of the non-Russian population has adopted the Russian language. Russian is playing an ever greater role chiefly as a means of communication between different peoples. What we are witnessing is the universalisation of bilingualism, where a person irrespective of nationality has full command of his native tongue, and of Russian.

The Communist Party takes firm action against the leftovers of nationalism and chauvinism that impede progress. The enemies of socialism, on the other hand, incite nationalist sentiment. In so doing, they try to capitalise on people's stronger sense of national dignity, their national pride over their economic and cultural progress. Playing on national feelings, they try to expunge socialist internationalism from the minds of Soviet people, and socialism is branded the enemy of national identity, speciously portrayed in terms of archaic mores and customs.

All people, the 25th CPSU Congress emphasised, must be brought up in the spirit of patriotism, pride for the socialist homeland and for the great achievements of the Soviet people, in a spirit of internationalism, intolerance of nationalism, chauvinism and national narrow-mindedness, and respect for all nations and nationalities. This is crucial for the further consolidation of the peoples of the USSR and for the shaping of the communist outlook.

National pride, ingrained in every Soviet citizen, is an important asset. First of all, it merges with loyalty to the Soviet country and fidelity to every man's internationalist duty. But if the natural attachment to one's nation becomes inflated, if it immures the individual in the national framework, closing off the horizons of the communist future now being built by all the peoples of the USSR, and causing indifference to the undertakings of people in other republics, then it degenerates into national egoism and bears no resemblance to real patriotism.

Socialism has added to the dignity of all peoples, big and small. It has given national feelings a new content. But in the socialist environment the national factor does not divide

people. Communists never differentiate people by their national origin. Soviet people are proud of their common wealth, of the gains of the October Revolution and socialist construction, of all that represents the socialist way of life. This all-Soviet feeling, shared by all the nations and nationalities in the country and described by Leonid Brezhnev as the all-national pride of the Soviet citizen, is evidence of the broad horizons of Soviet people, their fidelity to the ideals of international brotherhood.

"The arrogant sense of superiority of one nation over another, let alone the mad idea of national or racial exclusiveness, is alien and odious to Soviet people," said Leonid Brezhnev in his report on the 50th anniversary of the USSR. "Soviet people are internationalists. That is how they have been educated by the Party and by our entire reality. But regardless of nationality or language, all Soviet people are proud of their great Motherland, the herald of a new era in mankind's history. They are proud of the inspired labour of millions, who have, under the leadership of the Communists, built a new, truly just and free society and created an unbreakable fraternal union of many peoples."¹

Socialism works against anything that may breed national animosity, that humiliates, that exposes people to absurd prejudice and superstition. Among other things, it uproots survivals of the feudal morality, family despotism, and the like. Socialist customs are replacing the old customs. When in an article on the CPSU's national policy, anti-Communist Alfred D. Low complains that "the cultural treasures of each nation" are devoured by the sea of "socialism" and "internationalism",² he refers not to the true national values, whose growth the Communist Party promotes in every way, but to attributes of the old exploiting system.

This brings us to the future of world culture. The foundations of international culture are already being laid. It is not a non-national culture. It embodies the finest national

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, pp. 85-86.

² *The Russian Review*, January 1963, p. 17.

achievements of different peoples, and synthesises precisely all these finest achievements.

Bourgeois ideologists maintain that international culture is a necessarily integrated and therefore standardised culture. They argue that communism impoverishes the spiritual life of the peoples. But what they say is groundless.

Lenin said that the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie "will enormously accelerate the downfall of national *partitions* of every kind, this without decreasing but, on the contrary, increasing a millionfold the 'differentiation' of humanity, in the meaning of the wealth and the variety in spiritual life, ideological trends, tendencies, and shades."¹ The future international culture will be diverse and will reflect the intense life of the members of communist society. The achievements of different national cultures will become the property of all the peoples.

Obliteration of national distinctions, particularly in the cultural domain, should be understood dialectically. The future synthesis of cultures is a highly fruitful process. We must remember, however, that the Party's slogan of the fusion of nations does not refer to the present. True, Marxists do not forget this ultimate aim—the natural fusion of nations following the triumph of communism all over the world—but would never think of forcibly prodding the process, for their approach to national problems is scientific.

Socialism does not remove national distinctions, nor does it perpetuate them. It creates conditions in which national distinctions can no longer be used to oppose one people to another, to propagate animosity.

Seizing on the Communist Party's actions against remnants of nationalism, bourgeois ideologists infer that socialism and communism mean forcible obliteration of national distinctions. The old national, they maintain, is gradually ousted by the international. They identify the national and the old. It is true that the culture of every people contains many valuable elements worth tending and developing. But Marxists will not cling to the old just because it is national; they have a clear view

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 274.

of what is arising in the present and what will arise in the future.

This brings us to the anti-Soviet attempts to contrast socialism to national traditions. Professor Robert S. Sullivant of the US, for example, endeavours to prove that the modern city is out of tune with the national character of the peoples of the Soviet Union, because some occult force ties them to the old-style village.¹ However, can anyone deny that socialism has brought a new life to the cities and villages of the Soviet Union, putting an end to the old-time patriarchalism and ignorance idealised by nationalists, and completely changing the people's cultural make-up? Socialism has blended or fused the interests of town dwellers and villagers, the interests of all the nations of the country, and has put them on the road of social progress.

For Soviet people "national" is a broad concept. Take the national classics, *The Lay of Igor's Host*, *David Sasunsky* or *The Knight in the Tiger's Skin*, they are national, but have become the patrimony of all the Soviet peoples, who cherish them. They have a special meaning for people in the Soviet Union, because *The Knight in the Tiger's Skin* extols friendship of the peoples, *David Sasunsky* extols diligence and peace, and *The Lay of Igor's Host* lauds patriotism and courage. Those are the traits socialism cultivates while opposing backward national customs.

Apart from misrepresenting national relations in the Soviet Union, anti-Communist ideologists give a false picture of the relations between countries of the socialist community. In particular, they ascribe to them an ingrained antagonism, allegedly the result of the opposite interests of highly-developed industrial states and economically underdeveloped countries. They try to prove that "rich" countries do not permit the industrialisation of the "poor". But a look at the relevant figures dispels any such notion. Gross industrial output in 1950-1974 increased 16-fold in Bulgaria, 19-fold in Rumania, 10-fold in Mongolia and in Poland, 9.2-fold in the Soviet Union, 6.8-fold in Hungary, 6.5-fold in Czechoslovakia and 6.9-fold in the German Democratic Republic. The figures

¹ See *Problems of Communism*, Washington, September/October 1967, Vol. XVI, pp. 47-48.

show that the less developed of these CMEA countries have a higher growth rate. The policy of gradually balancing the levels of economic development is consistently implemented through the common efforts of the USSR and the other socialist countries.

Bourgeois ideologists maintain that "centrifugal tendencies" are bound to gain, and that the socialist countries are bound to drift to "national communism". They argue that the "universality" of Marxist-Leninist ideology makes it incompatible with national distinctions, that this automatically and ineluctably leads countries to depart from "universality" and to take up nationalist positions.

There is no denying that Marxism-Leninism, an internationalist doctrine, defines the general laws that must be observed if the struggle for socialism and communism is to be successful. But the very substance of Marxism-Leninism, a creative teaching, requires concrete approaches and accommodation of national features, lacking which there can be no scientifically-grounded policy. Every party guided by Marxism-Leninism determines the right combination of the general and particular in its practical activity. This is something exponents of "national communism" refuse to accept. The essence of "national communism", in fact, is not that it honours national specifics—to take them into account is an imperative condition of scientific communism—but that it ignores the general laws of socialist construction, the international interests of the working class, and tries to subordinate the common interest to national egoism.

Anti-communist propaganda promotes tales of "Soviet hegemony" and violations of the sovereignty of socialist countries. But this is slander designed to stoke up nationalist sentiment.

Imperialist ideologists aim their attacks first of all at the friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. They know that the historic experience of socialist construction in the Soviet Union is at the disposal of the world communist movement and that the Soviet economic and military power is a dependable shield for the revolutionary gains of the world socialist system. And since head-on propaganda against the Soviet Union is not yielding results,

they are beginning to resort to more devious manoeuvres. They like to contrast the building of the new society in different countries, and shower praise on advocates of "separate socialist development". They even promise "aid" to those who would reject cooperation with the Soviet Union, who would agree to build socialism without Communists.

By and large, anti-communist ideologists admit the failure of the various doctrines of "liberating" the socialist countries, that is, of a forcible overthrow of the socialist system. Now they are offering a theory of "evolution" or "erosion", inferring a gradual evolution of the socialist countries to "national communism" and abandonment of internationalist obligations. Professor H. Gordon Skilling, author of *Communism National and International*, writes that the Western attitude towards the socialist countries "should be subtle and restrained, avoiding loud propaganda and threats of intervention, and encouraging the peaceful evolution of national communism within the communist bloc".¹ US Sovietologist Brzezinski, another exponent of the "evolution" theory, thinks hopes of an economic metamorphosis of the socialist system are in vain, and suggests a different order for subversive activity. At first, he says, there must be a change in ideology and policy, so that changes in the social and economic system can follow. Accordingly, anti-Communists promote the idea of "political pluralism" for particular socialist countries, and recommend supporting "polycentrism" in international socialism.

There were times in the history of the working-class movement when, as Lenin said, "in order to safeguard socialism, people were forced to struggle against a rabid and morbid nationalism".² Now, the elemental gush of petty-bourgeois sentiment is creating a situation that complicates the struggle against nationalism. And revolutionaries in all countries should uphold the internationalist Marxist-Leninist doctrine with redoubled vigilance, and counter chauvinist attacks by the unity and ideological maturity of the international working class.

¹ H. Gordon Skilling, *Communism National and International*, Toronto, 1964, p. 161.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 298.

The fraternal parties counter imperialist plans of dividing the countries of the socialist community by unity, revolutionary vigilance, and faithful friendship with the world's first socialist country. The experience of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, its First Secretary János Kadar said, shows that "to serve the international and national objectives at one and the same time, we must follow the path of progress, uniting with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and with the international working class."¹

Marxists-Leninists would never think of speculating on national values.

The question of sovereignty is a vivid example. Anti-Communist ideologists juggle about with it. They try to show that proletarian solidarity—a dependable guarantee of the freedom and progress of the countries of the socialist community in the acute struggle of the two systems and in face of NATO subversion—conflicts with sovereignty. But who is loudest in accusing Communists of "flouting" sovereignty? Those who justified the US aggression in Indo-China, who have not ceased supporting racialism and colonialism, who have always scorned sovereignty and national values in general. Here, for example, is what John G. Stoessinger says in *The Might of Nations*: "It is sovereignty, more than any other single factor, that is responsible for the anarchic condition of international relations."²

Marxists-Leninists hold a diametrically opposite view. They stand for the utmost respect of the sovereignty of all countries. It is a well-known fact that the Soviet Union has done much to strengthen the independence of the socialist countries. Many of them won their sovereignty mainly as a result of the Soviet victory in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945. Socialism and sovereignty are indivisible. *Only socialism assures the sovereign rights of peoples in the fullest possible sense.* The lie about "limited sovereignty" was invented by anti-Communist ideologists and is naturally rejected by Marxists-Leninists.

¹ See *Great October and the World Revolutionary Movement*, Moscow, 1967, pp. 172-73 (in Russian).

² John G. Stoessinger, *The Might of Nations. World Politics in Our Time*, New York, 1961, p. 10.

This was emphasised at the 1969 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties by Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, and heads of delegations of the fraternal socialist countries, who stressed the validity of the fundamental Leninist tenets on the class-internationalist approach to national problems.

Attacking the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of proletarian internationalism, bourgeois ideologists contrast the growing national consciousness of the peoples to their solidarity with the revolutionary forces. Michigan University Professor Kenneth E. Boulding maintains in his book *The Meaning of the Twentieth Century*—without a stitch of evidence—that the concept of an “international proletariat” has become fiction and that the non-class national consciousness is the strongest motive power in present-day society.¹ He totally ignores the loyalty of the working class to the international, as well as national, interests of the working people, the combination of its strictly class approach with true patriotism. Moreover, by “national” imperialist ideologists mean the archaic customs and superstitions surviving in people's minds, not the progressive aspirations of the masses. Arnold Toynbee, the noted British bourgeois historian, in *The Impact of the Russian Revolution 1917-1967*, endeavoured to disprove Lenin's theory of the natural alliance of the proletariat of Russia and the West with the oppressed masses in Asia and Africa. He built his argument on the divergent religious traditions of the peoples of these continents.²

Attaching paramount importance in the history of mankind to the evolution of religion, Toynbee sought converts to the mythical “Christian brotherhood”, which he traced to “Western civilisation”. The apologists of capitalism cannot get it into their heads that the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America are sick of the West's “Christian” civilisation, which had for so many centuries condoned colonialists, racialists and conquerors. The Soviet Union, where the building of the new

¹ Kenneth E. Boulding, *The Meaning of the Twentieth Century. The Great Transition*, New York, 1965, p. 170.

² *The Impact of the Russian Revolution 1917-1967. The Influence of Bolshevism on the World Outside Russia*, London, 1967, p. 6.

society welded all the peoples and put an end to national and religious strife, is an inspiring example for all fighters for national independence and against imperialism. Though many oppressed peoples are fighting monopoly under the flag of nationalism and religion, their experience of social and economic development urges them to break out of the narrow framework of national exclusiveness and invigorate their fraternal alliance with all the revolutionary forces of our time. The socialist ideal of the brotherhood of peoples is winning over all true patriots.

Socialism has rallied all the revolutionary and democratic forces. Acting in unison they are strong enough to contain the aggressive designs of the imperialists, to curb their policy of suppressing the national liberation movement, and to assure peace and security. The Peace Programme adopted by the 24th CPSU Congress and expanded by the 25th Congress, its successful implementation, has a strong, mobilising effect. Peace on earth, national independence and social progress, and the building of a new society free from the horrors of imperialism, are no longer a vapoury dream, but a workable and realistic goal. Moreover, they are the actual practice of millions of people across the globe. The materialisation of the cherished progressive ideals of mankind depends on concerted action by champions of the people's interests.

The persevering efforts of the fraternal Communist and Workers' Parties, their consistently internationalist policy, contribute to the Communists' struggle for unity. It has become apparent in recent years that the attempts of bourgeois ideologists and of revisionists to disprove the international nature of Leninism, to contrast Marxism to Leninism, have failed. New contingents of fighters for freedom and socialism are lining up under the Leninist banner all over the world.

The current turn to détente necessitates greater ideological vigilance by the Communist and Workers' Parties. Their ideological work must be more vigorous and assertive. Anti-Communist centres are exploiting calls for "free flow of ideas, people and information" in order to win more scope for subversive activity. They do not conceal their intention of using the expanding cooperation between capitalist and socialist countries to propagate the bourgeois ideology in the socialist

states. So, the Marxists-Leninists are making their ideological work continuously more meaningful. They show that peaceful coexistence does not signify an easing of the ideological struggle, that ideological reconciliation is impossible. Continuous and persevering efforts are made to dispel illusory complacency and ideological passivity. The struggle against bourgeois ideology cannot cease until capitalism is totally extirpated and the leftovers of bourgeois ideas are purged from the minds of the builders of the classless society.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties are aware that as long as imperialism with its aggressive policy survives, straining to disrupt the world socialist community and suppress the liberation movement of the peoples, it is the duty of every revolutionary to line up on the same side of the barricades with all fighters against imperialism and hold aloft the banner of international solidarity. Fidelity to internationalism is the guarantee that the imperialists will fail in their bid to fan nationalism, and that socialism, the communist movement, will gain new victories in the battle for the bright future of all peoples.

CONCLUSION

Nations and national relations are not just the present, but also the future, of the peoples. Marxism-Leninism enables us to penetrate into that future, to anticipate the development trends as well as the content of national and international processes. Scientific communism, Lenin said, places the problems of nationality and of the state on a "historical footing, not only in the sense of explaining the past but also in the sense of a bold forecast of the future and of bold practical action".¹

The prospect of change in the development of nations and national relations is implicit in the whole content of our epoch, in man's passage from capitalism to socialism. As Lenin had predicted, the transition is taking place against a background of accelerated social progress. The development of national and international processes is also more rapid. But though this adds some significance to the problem of nations and national relations, this significance for the ratio of the social to the national is only relatively, not absolutely, greater than in the preceding periods. It is quite possible, of course, that the declining capitalist world will, for example, succeed in augmenting the disruptive effect of nationalism and chauvinism in individual countries, even regions. But these effects will be no more than temporary.

In fact, nationalism has no future. The role of internationalism is bound to grow, because it contains vast sources of

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 72.

progress based on all-round cooperation and fraternal mutual assistance. The world's social transformation will continue. And the content of the problem of nations and national relations will change only in step with, and on the basis of, this transformation. Bourgeois claims that the role of the national question is bound to increase to the detriment of the social question are scientifically groundless. In fact, the present slightly greater significance of the national question in connection with the precipitous growth of the national liberation movement of half the world's population, has already begun to decline. On winning national liberation, the Asian and African peoples have begun to understand the urgency of radical social solutions. They do not deny the importance of national problems, but are concentrating more on the choice of the way of development, on building a social and state system that would rule out exploitation and oppression of man by man, of one people by another.

In the socialist environment the main content of national and international processes is centred on the final consolidation of the new, socialist nations and nationalities still in their formative or transformative stage, and on their all-round development, efflorescence and steady convergence.

For the peoples of the developed capitalist states the central problem in the content of national processes in the foreseeable future is a further dissociation of the bourgeoisie and the working class and a consolidation of all sound forces round the proletarian vanguard. In the national liberation zone the central aim is to strengthen national statehood and the economy, and to launch the processes of national consolidation, the formation of nations and nationalities, as a necessary factor of social progress.

No matter how great the role of national processes, the progress of mankind is determined to a far greater extent by the predominant role of the international processes. True, as long as the world capitalist system exists, as long as the struggle between the two opposite systems continues, the international processes cannot develop in full measure. But imperialism is not able to reverse them. They are impelled by the objective needs of social progress, the proliferation of ties between nations and nationalities in the scientific and technological

revolution, and the insuperable will of the peoples for peace and fraternal mutual relations.

The difference in stages of development among the peoples of the two world systems is also reflected in the content of the national question. For the peoples of the developed capitalist countries and the developing states the essential aim in the immediate future is to transform their national life along socialist lines. On the other hand, the countries of the world socialist community, which have resolved the national question, are already beginning to tackle the problems of development in the communist tomorrow.

The fusion of nations in the future, as the Marxists-Leninists see it, is inevitable once all the peoples go over to communism and pass through a definite period of all-round growth and convergence. No one can tell yet how long this period will be nor what stages of maturity will be passed in the development of world communism.

Engels pointed out that on passing through all the stages of development every nation will arrive "at the point where all nations, all different paths, must meet at Communism".¹ But seeing this as a matter of a very remote future, he warned against the kind of abolition of nationalities that "occurs in our heads through the medium of pure thought, with the help of the imagination and in the absence of facts".²

The credit for projecting the ideas of Marx and Engels in more concrete terms belongs to Lenin. His life's work dates to the time of the development of the world revolution and the emergence of world socialism. This enabled him to define more clearly the main laws of the development of national and international processes and at least approximately outline the most important stages of the advance of nations and national relations towards communism.

The Marxist-Leninist approach to the realities of the world is not confined to just determining the tasks of the day. It also requires a clear knowledge of the stages and of the ways of fulfilling these tasks. This was Lenin's approach to the future of nations and national relations. Though some of the tendencies in the development of society were then still

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* (in 3 volumes), Vol. 3, p. 393.

² See Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 2, S. 612.

inchoate, he strove not only to conceptualise them in theory (while warning against excessive haste in effecting tasks it was still too early to tackle), but also to formulate his conclusions as practical objectives.

There is a long period of transition, Lenin said, from the formation of nations during the decay of feudalism and the emergence of capitalism to the inevitable fusion of nations. Throughout this period the essential objectives of the development of nations and national relations are reached through the flowering and convergence of nations in socialist conditions.

The prime objective and, in fact, the precondition for the solution of the national question under socialism, as Lenin saw it, was complete emancipation of all oppressed peoples—complete in the sense of eliminating national oppression and inequality, and also in the sense of self-determination, not short of forming a national state and choosing the social system. That sort of self-determination is conceivable only under socialism, where the national state controlled by the working people becomes an instrument of progress. This was why Lenin said that without the right to such a state “there is no path to complete, voluntary rapprochement and merging of nations”.¹

Complete emancipation of all the peoples, and consequently complete freedom of development, pave the way to the next dual task: the flowering and convergence of nations. This objective was defined by Lenin on the basis of the main law of socialism relating to nations and national relations, which he discovered and formulated. This law operates from the moment socialist nations and nationalities emerge to the moment they wither away in the stage of mature communism.

The flowering and convergence of nations are more than a manifestation of the objective laws of social development. They are also the result of deliberate human activity, first of all activity by the working class and its party. On the eve of the October Revolution in Russia, Lenin stressed that the proletarian party seeks the drawing together and further merging of nations on the basis of a free and fraternal union of the workers and working people of all nations. Doubly so following

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 75.

the victory of socialism, which, as Lenin said, facilitates and enormously accelerates the convergence and fusion of nations.

In practice, flowering and convergence passes a number of stages differing in degree of maturity. Lenin delved specially into the problem of the *nations' complete unity*. In the Party Programme drafted for the Party's 7th Congress he urged "federation of nations, as a transition to a *conscious* and closer unity of the working people, when they have learnt *voluntarily* to rise above national dissension".¹ Elsewhere in the draft he described federation as "a transition to voluntary fusion".² And in the Programme itself, which was adopted by the 8th Congress, federation was portrayed as "one of the transitional forms towards complete unity".³ The same assessment of federation is to be found in Lenin's theses on the national-colonial question, which he drew up for the 2nd Congress of the Communist International.⁴

This shows that for Lenin *complete unity* was an independent and highly important stage in the convergence of nations. He did not relate it to just the building of national states. As early as July 1916, he referred to an unavoidable period of "the *practical* elimination of even the slightest national friction and the least national mistrust, for an accelerated drawing together and fusion of nations".⁵ We can take this as being the content of the period of the complete unity of nations in the process of their convergence. Evidently, this was the period Lenin had in mind somewhat earlier, when referring to the inevitable "amalgamation of all nations in the higher unity".⁶

In multinational countries, to judge from Lenin's writings, complete unity of nations would come about from a high level of socialist production and democratisation of society.⁷ In the framework of world socialism priority goes to the further steady promotion of the universal process of internationalisation in all economic, political and spiritual spheres.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 155.

² *Ibid.*, p. 158.

³ *CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions...*, Vol. 2, p. 45 (in Russian).

⁴ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 146.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. 22, p. 325.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol. 20, p. 34.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol. 22, p. 325.

One of the main aspects of universal internationalisation is the forming of a single socialist world economy. Lenin stressed that the tendency towards a worldwide economy as one whole is distinctly felt even under capitalism. But it will not emerge until socialism wins on a worldwide scale.

The second aspect in the process of universal internationalisation is the evolution of a single international culture. It is beyond question, however, that until the complete unity of nations is achieved, international culture will still be in a formative stage, and not in its consummate form.

Lenin's idea of the period of the complete unity of nations was developed in specific terms in the new Programme of the CPSU. "Communist construction," it says, "constitutes a new stage in the development of national relations in the USSR in which the nations will draw still closer together until complete unity is achieved."¹ The way to this unity passes through joint construction of the material and technical base of communism, the increasingly intensive exchange of material and intellectual values, eradication of boundaries between classes, and the development of communist features of culture, ethics and life style.

The Programme of the CPSU conceives the complete unity of nations not as assimilation or mingling of peoples, but on the basis of a flowering of their energy, of greater mutual trust and friendship, and a mutual enrichment of their cultures. "With the victory of communism in the USSR," says the CPSU Programme, "the nations will draw still closer together, their economic and ideological unity will increase and the communist traits common to their spiritual make-up will develop. However, the obliteration of national distinctions, and especially of language distinctions, is a considerably longer process than the obliteration of class distinctions."²

The theory and practice of socialist and communist construction in the multinational Soviet Union have added new propositions to the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the development of nations and national relations. One of the most important is that along the way to the fusion of nations the

¹ *The Road to Communism*, p. 559.

² *Ibid.*, p. 560.

peoples of the world must inevitably pass a stage of international communities—first within the framework of multinational countries, then as zonal communities, and, finally, as a single international community of the entire world.

It follows from the above description of the period of the complete unity of nations, as gleaned from the works of Lenin and from the Programme of the CPSU, that the flowering and convergence of nations achieved in this period is still insufficient for any immediate fusion. If the period of the complete unity of nations is highlighted mainly by the absence of the least national friction and the slightest national mistrust, as Lenin had put it, there must evidently follow a period when gradual convergence of nations gives way to accelerated convergence, and when on the basis of this, already in the framework of a single international community, there begins the process of the *fusion* of nations.

Lenin was certain that national and state distinctions between peoples and countries “will continue to exist for a very long time to come, even after the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established on a worldwide scale”.¹

The socialist world has given the communist and working-class movement experience of tremendous and truly historic importance. The Communists, workers, all working people, want the “world socialist system to be a well-knit family of nations, building and defending the new society together, and mutually enriching each other with experience and knowledge, a family strong and united, which the people of the world would regard as the prototype of the future world community of free nations”.²

Lenin's teaching on the development of nations and national relations is of the utmost importance as the explication of the past and present, as a forecast of the future. It is also vastly important for the practice of national and international processes in the modern world. Lenin's ideas have stood the test of time, and the years to come will yield new proof of Lenin's teaching, will see its further development.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 92.

² L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Vol. 3, p. 338.

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 21, Zubovsky
Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

**PROGRESS
PUBLISHERS WILL
SOON PUBLISH**

**PROGRESS
PUBLISHERS WILL
SOON PUBLISH**

The Soviet Union: A General Survey

This book contains a comprehensive geographical description of the Soviet Union. The product of the collaboration of leading geographers of different specialities and scientific interests, *The Soviet Union: A General Survey* is nevertheless an integrated study of the nature, population and economy of the USSR. Included in the text are many illustrations and interesting cartographic materials.

**PROGRESS
PUBLISHERS WILL
SOON PUBLISH**

**PROGRESS
PUBLISHERS WILL
SOON PUBLISH**

PROGRESS. BOOKS ABOUT THE USSR SERIES

ILYIN V. *Made in the USSR.*

The English press has been informing its readers about the widespread sale of Soviet automobiles, watches and cameras. Is the increase in Soviet exports to industrially advanced countries an incidental fact or a natural development? Journalist V. Ilyin's story may help to answer this question. He describes the Soviet export trade since the time of the revolution, its present dimensions, and the success enjoyed by Soviet goods—steel casting units, planes, machinetools, nuclear power plant equipment and other industrial hardware—on the world market.

The book includes photographic illustrations which give a good picture of the manufactured goods bearing the stamp "Made in the USSR".

The fundamental social changes in the world today would be impossible without account being taken of the national problems. The Leninist teaching on the national question is the result of a profound analysis of the laws governing the development of human society.

The present book makes a thorough study of the national question in bourgeois society, shows the ways in which this question has been solved under socialism, and treats a number of problems which determine its international substance.

Considerable space is devoted to an analysis of the development of nations and nationalities under socialism and to the moulding of socialist patriotism and internationalism.

